Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-128
Wednesday
3 July 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-128 *3 July 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Final Warsaw Pact Committee Meeting in Prague 1
Yanayev Speech *[TASS]* 1
Protocol Disbanding Pact *[TASS]* 3
Committee Communique *[TASS]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Presidential Spokesman Holds News Briefing *[TASS]* 6
Moscow Economic Conference Noted *[TASS]* 6
Expectations for Meetings With G-7, Bush *[TASS]* 6
Democratic Movement Statement 'Positive' *[TASS]* 7
Hope for Stability in SFRY *[TASS]* 7
Gorbachev Looking to 'Different' Ties With G-7 *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 7
Correspondent on Gorbachev's 'Liberal Spring' *[Moscow TV]* 8
Gorbachev Meets Financial Company Chief *[TASS]* 8
Gorbachev Receives Western Businessman *[TASS]* 8
Army Paper Cites Churkin on PRC Border Issues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 8
UNSC Agrees on Iraqi Reparations, Weapons *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 9
Luchinskiy Addresses Workers Movement Researchers *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Previews of Bush-Gorbachev Meeting 10
Bush Cited *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jul]* 10
Commentary Views Talks *[Moscow International]* 10
Diplomat Previews Talks *[INTERFAX]* 11
Petrovskiy Talks With U.S. Official *[TASS]* 11
Commentary on Near East, Gulf Role of U.S. *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 11
Goskino Denies Complicity in Film Pirating *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 13
Air Route Opens Between Anchorage, Magadan *[Moscow TV]* 14

China

Report of Jiang Zemin Meeting With Polozkov *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 14
Polozkov Reviews China Trip *[TASS]* 15
Correction to Report on Polozkov Beijing Arrival 16
CPSU Anniversary Greetings to CPC *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 16
Commentary on PRC Accession to Nuclear Treaty *[Moscow International]* 16
Deputy Defense Minister Completes Visit to PRC *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]* 17
Chinese Tug, Barges Dock in Komsomolsk-na-Amure *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 17
Sino-Soviet Talks on Worker Exchange Held *[INTERFAX]* 17
Dalai Lama's Visit to Ulan-Ude in Doubt *[INTERFAX]* 17

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shenin Meets With SRV Party Leaders *[TASS]* 18
Reportage on Cambodian Peace Accords 18
Official Says Accords 'Very Positive' *[INTERFAX]* 18
Commentator on Accords *[Moscow International]* 18

Near East & South Asia

Resolutions on Iraq Program To Be Observed *[INTERFAX]* 19
Commentary on Unpredictability of Saddam Husayn *[Moscow International]* 19
Full Ties With Israel Said 'On the Agenda' *[INTERFAX]* 20
CPSU Delegation Meets Yasir 'Arafat in Tunis *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 20
Cooperation Protocol With Tunisia Signed *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 20
Lukyanov Meets Sri Lankan Delegation *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 20
Bombing Shows Lax Afghan Border Security *[NOVOYE VREMYA 10 Jun]* 20

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Discusses ANC National Conference *[Moscow International]* 21
CPSU Greets ANC National Conference *[TASS]* 22
Statement on S. Africa Nonproliferation Decision *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]* 22
Ethiopian Political Crisis Analyzed *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 22
USSR Ready To 'Cooperate' in Ethiopia *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]* 24

East Europe

Situation in Yugoslavia Reported 25
PRAVDA Report *[1 Jul]* 25
Commentary Notes 'Deep Concern' *[Moscow International]* 25
Expert on 'Acute Conflict' *[INTERFAX]* 26
Belgrade Correspondent on Situation *[Moscow International]* 26
Report on CSCE Reaction *[INTERFAX]* 27
RSFSR Official Comments *[INTERFAX]* 27
Yanayev, Bessmertnykh Continue Prague Visit 27
Meet With Havel *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jul]* 27
Meet With Romanian Leaders *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jul]* 28
Further on Meeting With Romanian Leaders *[TASS]* 28
Depart Prague for Home *[TASS]* 28
Gorbachev, Hungary's Goncz Exchange Telegrams *[TASS]* 28
CSFR Indignation at Yazov Interview Cited *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jul]* 29
TV Reports Troop Withdrawal Completed *[Moscow TV]* 30
East Europe Urged To Uphold Basic Rights *[INTERFAX]* 30
Ovchinnikov on East Europe Withdrawal Issues *[Moscow International]* 30

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

'Text' of Statement on Former Bloc Leaders *[TASS]* 31
Guidelines for Penal Code Adopted *[TASS]* 31
Union Treaty's 'Lack of Clarity' Debated *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]* 31
Privatization Law Debate Reviewed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]* 32
USSR Supreme Soviet 2 July Session *[Moscow TV]* 33

Political & Social

Democratic Reform Movement Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 34
IZVESTIYA Runs 'Extracts' of Appeal *[3 Jul]* 35
TASS Reports on Movement 36
NPS Supports Movement *[INTERFAX]* 37
Sobchak, Popov Remark on Movement *[Moscow Radio]* 37
CPSU 'Schism' Concerns PRAVDA Readers *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 37
Shevardnadze Comments on CPSU Investigation *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No. 25]* 39
Pondering CPSU Membership *[INTERFAX]* 40
Yakovlev on Need for New Party *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jul]* 40
Soyuz Leader Sees Constitution as Paramount *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Jun]* 43
Marxist Party Fears 'Capitalist Dictatorship' *[Moscow International]* 45
Debate on New Union Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 45

Senior Officials Under Corruption Probe *[TRUD 28 Jun]* 48
Primary Organizations Urged To Reassert Role *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 49
Documents on IZVESTIYA Dispute Circulated *[29 Jun]* 51
Validity of IZVESTIYA Appointments Confirmed *[2 Jul]* 52
Protest Over Editor's Appointment Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 28 Jun]* 54
Journalists Concerned About Newspaper Conflict *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Gorbachev Favors Entrepreneurship Council *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Bessmertnykh Sums Up Minsk Chernobyl Conference *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 56
Wage Reform Planned for Maritime Enterprises *[TASS]* 56
Interethnic 'Rapid Deployment Unit' Established *[TASS]* 56
KGB Uncovers Art Treasures, Antiques *[INTERFAX]* 56
Poll Shows Concern for Health, Food Budget *[INTERFAX]* 56
Proponent of Limited Nuclear War Ridiculed *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]* 57
TASS Reviews Press for 3 July 58

Economic

Interrepublican Economic Commission Meets *[Moscow TV]* 59
Gorbachev Views Progress, G-7 *[INTERFAX]* 59
'Everything Hinges on Accord' *[TASS]* 60
Pavlov on 'Grave' Situation *[TASS]* 60
More on Pavlov Comments *[INTERFAX]* 60
Republican Leaders Remark *[Moscow TV]* 61
'Contradictions' Mark Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Reasons for Higher Customs Scales Questioned *[Moscow Russian TV]* 62
Uzbek President Views Economic Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 63
Funds Allocated for Krasnodar Cardiology Center *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 63
USSR State Bank Official on Finance Issues *[Moscow Radio]* 64
USSR Law on Economic Arbitration *[cross-reference]* 64
USSR Law on Protection of Consumer Rights *[cross-reference]* 64
USSR Law on Resolution of Labor Disputes *[cross-reference]* 64
Tula Small Arms Factory in Begins Conversion *[Moscow TV]* 64

Agricultural

Impact of Weather on Farming Areas Viewed *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 66

Scientific

Cooperation Accord Signed With French Center *[TASS]* 66
Three 'Big' Nuclear Accidents Before Chernobyl *[Berlin ADN]* 66
Parameters of 'Gorizont' Satellite Listed *[TASS]* 67

Military

Troop Withdrawal From Szczecin, Poland Reported *[TASS]* 67
Southern Group of Forces Dissolved on 27 Jun *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]* 67
Functions of CPSU's New Army Body Described *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]* 68

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Estonian Government Takes Economic Measures *[Tallin Radio]* 71
Conference on Baltic Russians Opens in Tallinn *[Tallinn Radio]* 71
Gary Hart Urges Investment in Latvia *[TASS]* 71
Landsbergis Cited on Visits to France, Germany 71
Gives Airport Interview *[Radio Vilnius]* 71
Details 'Political' Meetings *[Radio Vilnius]* 72
New Lithuanian Military Commanders Announced *[Moscow Radio]* 72
Black Beret Activities Throughout Union Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 72
OMON Not Within Oversight Committee's Purview *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 73

RSFSR

President Yeltsin Pays Visit to Novosibirsk *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Signs Decree *[INTERFAX]* 73
Economic Model Detailed *[Radio Rossii]* 74
Views Problems With Union Treaty *[Radio Rossii]* 74
Yeltsin: 'Uphill Struggle' To Build New Russia *[INTERFAX]* 74
Yeltsin Urged To Support Independent TV Network *[INTERFAX]* 74
Supreme Soviet Concerned About SFRY Events *[Moscow Radio]* 74
Tatarstan President Views Union Treaty Issues *[Moscow Radio]* 75
Shakhray Assails Draft Union Treaty *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 Jul]* 75
Silayev: Soviet Cabinet Action 'Robbing Russia' *[INTERFAX]* 78
Conference on Russian Interests Abroad Noted *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 29 Jun]* 78
Justice Minister Discusses Tasks, Goals *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 Jun]* 79
Minister Discusses Satellite Program *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 Jun]* 81
Communist Party Secretary Zyuganov Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Jun]* 82
Russian Role in Arctic, Scandinavia Stressed *[Oslo AFTENPOSTEN 27 Jun]* 85

Western Republics

Debates at Belorussian Parliament Reported *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jul]* 86
Belorussian Trade Union Chief Urges New Law *[INTERFAX]* 86
Belorussian Communists Decision on Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Ukraine Supreme Soviet Hears Anticrisis Plan *[Kiev Radio]* 87
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Discusses Union Treaty *[TASS]* 88
Ukraine Committee Opposes Union Treaty *[Kiev Radio]* 88
Ukraine Democratic Revival Party Opens Congress 88
Various Topics Discussed *[Kiev Radio]* 88
Resolutions Adopted *[Kiev Radio]* 89
Ukraine, Armenia Discuss Mutual Goods Deliveries *[Kiev Radio]* 89
Moldova Leader on Molotov-Ribbentrop Conference *[INTERFAX]* 89

Caucasus

Armenian Deputy Favors Sovereign State *[INTERFAX]* 90
Armenian Police Agencies Deny Article *[Yerevan International]* 90
Armenia Decides To Retain 1918 Anthem *[Yerevan Radio]* 90
Armenia Asks G-7 To Intercede With Gorbachev *[ARMENPRES]* 91
Azerbaijan Agrees To Sign Union Treaty *[Moscow TV]* 91

Central Asia

Kazakh's Nazarbayev Assails 'Extremist Demands' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]* 91
Kazakhstan Rejects Referendum on Election *[Moscow Radio]* 92
Kyrgyz's Akayev Outvoted on Land Ownership Issue
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Jun] 92
Kyrgystan Adopts Laws on Market Economy *[TASS]* 92

Final Warsaw Pact Committee Meeting in Prague

Yanayev Speech

LD0107183191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1702 GMT 1 Jul 91

["Yanayev's Address at Political Consultative Committee Conference in Prague transmitted for 'IZVESTIYA' at delegation's request"—TASS headline]

[Text] Prague, 1 Jul (TASS)—Addressing the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states, Gennadiy Yanayev, vice president of the USSR, said:

Today we are going to make an important decision—on ending the validity of the Warsaw Pact and thus on disbanding our alliance. The Soviet Union advocates this and representatives of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria have advocated it. This decision is based on objective factors—profound changes in Europe and changes both within our countries themselves and in relations between them.

Europe is engaged in trying to understand new and unprecedented realities. The new vision of the European process is taking shape against a background of events which are unfolding tempestuously and differences of opinion which are being voiced about the prospects.

We see two levels to the problems—the potential for uniting Europe and the real state of relations between its peoples, burdened by the load of the past which has not been completely overcome. In other words, we are talking about the dialectics of the possible and the actual, of what is desired and what is real.

The concept of the omnipotence of force as the maker of history is gradually fading into the past. It is no longer the politics of force but the force of politics that determines the parameters of the European process, although that is going unevenly. Radical changes in Eastern Europe are providing an unprecedented opportunity to build a new and more stable, humane and, at the same time, economically accessible security structure which would exclude war from European policy.

And was it not this that our countries were striving for through the decades of the existence of the Warsaw Pact? One can assess the results of its activity in different ways, but the indisputable fact remains that the Warsaw Pact has made a substantial contribution to peace and stability on the continent since 1955, has given a decisive impulse to those processes that allow us to talk today about a new stage in European and world development. We can rightly be proud of the fact that the Europe-wide process was initiated and the idea of a pan-European meeting put forward by our countries jointly, which materialized in the Helsinki conference in 1975, proud of the fact that we were the first to bid farewell to the former confrontational stereotypes, to adopt a new defensive military doctrine based on the principle of rational adequacy, the first to set foot upon the path of rejecting bloc thinking in the military-political sphere.

Naturally, from today's standpoint, assessments of Warsaw Pact activity cannot be straightforward ones. Times are different now and ideas about relations between states are different, new governments are at the state helm. Today we cannot approve of all the actions of the Warsaw Pact. The sharp criticism of these actions, at times, is not surprising.

For the attention of the 'IZVESTIYA' editorial office

Time will put everything into its place and will make it possible to judge all aspects of the organization's activity in the then historical context objectively and without excessive emotions. Be that as it may, the Warsaw Pact was the child of its day. It served to ensure the security of the member states and it fulfilled the role of an instrument for maintaining military and strategic parity between East and West in a sufficiently complex and tense period. The years during which the Warsaw Pact existed were peaceful years in Europe. Now we are entering a new condition in which the ways of ensuring stability are going to have to be formed anew. Our goal is the creation of an all-European security system and the ending of the division of the continent into blocs and groupings which inevitably give rise to instability. We are operating in that direction and intend to continue so to operate.

The military and strategic panorama of the continent is changing. The process of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the countries of Eastern Europe is proceeding on a wide basis—a process which has already been completed in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. There must be no ambiguities or false interpretations here. The new doctrine of reasonable defense sufficiency which has been adopted in the Soviet Union envisages that the "security belt" of the Soviet Union runs along the perimeter of our frontiers and that Soviet troops are deployed within the bounds of our country.

To judge from recent statements and decisions by the North Atlantic Alliance adopted in Brussels and Copenhagen, NATO is also responding to changes in the situation in Europe and the world. In our view, the intentions of members of this alliance to reduce their armed forces, jointly to reexamine the risky strategy of forward based defense and of having a low threshold for using nuclear weapons, to move toward what we understand as a tangible reduction in stocks of nuclear weapons, and not to expand the block's sphere of activity deserve attention.

At the same time, no matter what anyone says to justify the continued existence of this military-political bloc, in its present form it is a structure belonging to the past which is poorly adapted for taking part in the process of profoundly transforming the situation in Europe. Inevitable questions arise: Against whom is this alliance now

directed, at whom are NATO's nuclear and conventional weapons aimed, and why is there a need for rapid reaction forces in Europe?

In making the decision to disband the Warsaw Pact, we are ahead of other military-political groups which exist in Europe. But, of course, we are in step with the times. The tendency to leave the bloc mode of security behind will gain strength. Recent steps in this direction are hopeful. A new conceptual basis for partnership relations was laid down in the joint declaration of the 22 states which was adopted at the Paris summit. One of the most important landmarks along the road of moving the pan-European process forward in all areas was the "Paris Charter for a New Europe". Its provisions for institutionalizing the CSCE are already taking on visible shape and are being embodied in practical decisions. The signing of the treaty on conventional armed forces which virtually rules out the likelihood of a sudden attack in Europe is also in accordance with the aims of further dismantling the material basis for military confrontation. Difficulties which have arisen recently in preparing the treaty for ratification have been successfully overcome in the spirit of partnership and mutually acceptable concessions. We have a green light on the road to concluding a treaty on strategic offensive weapons and starting to formulate a new mandate at talks on arms reductions in Europe.

Thus, Europe is seeing the intensive creation of the foundation of a new world order which should eliminate potential sources of danger and confrontation. This is no longer just words and good intentions. It is reality and its significance was graphically demonstrated at the recent session of the Foreign Affairs Committee of CSCE member states in Berlin.

Naturally, there are still many difficult tasks to be resolved in the construction of the common European home and a program for their stage-by-stage resolution has to be drafted by joint efforts. The meeting of heads of state and government of the countries participating in the all-European process in the Finnish capital in 1992 should play an important role in this connection.

At the same time we, like our partners, are not inclined to underestimate the problems and side-effects caused by the radical turnabout in European affairs. Europe is now at a crossroads. It could step decisively into the 21st century, if the Europeans can find within themselves the strength to follow unswervingly the new thinking and orient themselves toward the CSCE process that consolidates everything. It could go backward, too, if political egotism prevails and the existing blocs and groupings are kept mothballed.

The Soviet Union evaluates the disbandment of the Warsaw Pact not as a return to the situation which existed before its formation, but as an important precondition for decisive movement forward, toward the horizons of a new Europe. What road to choose? How to avoid recoils in the historic movement of the European peoples toward a postconfrontation era? How to extinguish conflicts of, so to speak, a new "type"?

It is not easy to answer these questions, particularly during the present period of transition when the old equilibrium has been upset and the new one is just coming into being.

Only the active introduction of elements of interdependence into the practice of the all-European process can effectively protect the offshoots of the new all-European peace. It is indeed interdependence, recognized and translated into the language of concrete policy, that is capable of becoming a new and more reliable factor of stability than the former mutual fear and at the same time the guarantee of Europe's irreversible transition to a new situation.

We see the future Europe as a single, politico-legal, economic, and cultural space within which there exists a union of states with common structures that maintain reliable security for all and in all dimensions and that ensure a high level of interaction.

With the elimination of the Warsaw Pact we are ending a definite period in relations between our countries and at the same time are opening a new stage in their development, although, as it seems to us, there is no need to begin all over again. The radical restructuring of our ties is quite capable of being combined with the observance of a reasonable continuity to the extent that this is in keeping with the real possibilities and the actual interests of the sides. I think we should preserve everything positive that has existed in the close cooperation of our countries over many years, everything that has linked millions of people by many threads, that has stood the test of time and is capable of exerting a positive influence upon the shaping and development of our relations in the subsequent period.

Of course, a great deal still remains to be done to work out a new and effective model for our relations. But the Soviet Union is already approaching these relations in a fundamentally new way. The novelty consists primarily in totally excluding the ideological component, which in the past created the appearance of preferences, while in reality it distorted genuine state interests.

In this regard I would like to state clearly that the Soviet Union has no "imperial" motives, and this also applies to central and eastern Europe, whatever might be written or said about this by certain journalists and politicians.

I do not undertake to judge the whole of Soviet society—there are, of course, various feelings—but at the state level, at the level of serious politicians, we have no nostalgia for the postwar period. We consistently aspire to clearly acknowledge each other's needs and concerns. We shall adhere steadfastly to the principles of freedom of choice, equality of rights, noninterference in internal affairs, and respect for the sovereignty of each state.

In this context I would like to stress in particular the importance of such a principle, stemming from both the UN Charter and the Helsinki Act, as the inviolability of borders and the territorial integrity of states. It is only on this basis that stability in both East Europe and on the European Continent as a whole is possible, as the redrawing of borders and the destruction of states will inevitably give rise to general unpredictable consequences, and will reduce to zero the positive results of the common European process. It is only on this basis that tranquility on the borders of our countries is possible, which is so necesary for carrying out deep internal reforms. Finally, it is only on this basis that mutual trust and genuine good-neighborliness are possible.

As far as the current state of our relations with the countries of central and eastern Europe are concerned, I'll say frankly that we are not satisfied with them.

Economic ties have found themselves in a crisis situation. We, clearly like the other countries represented here, are suffering direct losses as a result of the cutback in traditional and mutually advantageous economic relations. We think that cooperation on that basis and in those areas in which there is mutual interest should be restored and moreover, as soon as possible.

Of course, the transition to the market and to enterprise requires a new approach to reciprocal trade and to our ties of cooperation. But the experience of the recent period clearly convinces us that we should not lose each other's markets. And it is difficult to build a common European economic area and at the same time to destroy the area of economic cooperation which has already emerged in the east of the continent. It is another matter that it has to be developed and supplemented with new structures, but not destroyed.

In the political sphere we would also like to reach new mutual understanding and cooperation. We would be ready for a more intensive exchange of views at all levels, including summit level, primarily on issues of bilateral cooperation, building a new Europe, and the prospects for developing relations between the west and the east of the continent, and on other major problems of the new world order toward which the international community is proceeding.

Many problems have arisen in the sphere of cultural ties and human contacts. The development of market relations is having a specific effect on this field. However, we intend to continue in future to give state backing to cultural exchanges, to the study of the language, history, and culture of friendly, neighboring countries, and to encourage border ties; in a word, to think about the future and not to forget everything of value in the historical cooperation between our peoples.

And yet one more thing: The scope and nature of the changes taking place in our countries are such that there is a certain confusion and disorientation in people's minds. Outbursts of nihilism occur and passions boil over, and these are often used in the domestic political struggle for opportunistic aims without consideration for the long-term consequences. Also, there is the revival of blatantly nationalist slogans, the persecution of dissidents, and attempts to play the "anti-Soviet" card, without regard for the insult this causes to the memory of Soviet people who fell in battle during World War II. Let us not close our eyes to these facts of the sociopolitical situation or belittle their significance.

Summing up, I would like to say that the restructuring of relations and the gradual move to the start of a new partnership and friendly cooperation is a task that requires patience, good-will, and foresight. We are in favor of dialogue. We think that the USSR's neighbors in Central and Eastern Europe have also been and will be committed to good relations with us, and to broad and full-blooded cooperation.

In this context, the issue of a new treaty base for mutual relations that is capable of creating a stable international and legal foundation for progressive development and cooperation in all fields acquires an ever greater importance. At the same time questions concerning the mutual provision of security must occupy an important place, we are convinced, in the treaties that are being concluded.

Taking into consideration the historical experience, the special significance of this problem is fully understandable. We want to remain good neighbors; no one must have an opportunity to set our countries against each other, to bring them into collision with each other, as has happened more than once in the past, unfortunately. The reciprocal obligations in this respect have to be precise and unambiguous and correspond to the principles of the UN Charter and to the CSCE Final Act. A willingness to move toward each other will undoubtedly help us to find mutually acceptable formulas for every bilateral treaty.

In conclusion, I would like to [passage indistinct] which will be totally in keeping with the interests of the peoples of our countries and bring benefit to the whole of Europe.

I join in the kind words addressed here to the leadership of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic for the great work in preparing and holding this conference and for the hospitality and the cordial welcome extended to us in golden Prague.

Thank you for your attention.

Protocol Disbanding Pact

LD0107165891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1422 GMT 1 Jul 91

["Protocol Terminating the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance"—TASS headline]

[Text] [no dateline as received]

Protocol

Ending the Validity of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance Signed in Warsaw on 14 May 1955 and the Protocol Extending Its Validity Signed in Warsaw on 26 April 1985

The states which are contracting parties to the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance which was signed in Warsaw on 14 May, 1955.

—taking into consideration the profound changes which are taking place in Europe, and which mean an end to confrontation and the split in the continent;

—intending in view of the new situation to develop energetically relations among themselves on a bilateral and, depending on the degree of interest, a multilateral basis;

—noting the significance of the joint declaration of the 22 states which signed the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe and stated that they are no longer enemies, and will build new relations of partnership and cooperation;

—having decided to promote a gradual shift toward all-European security structures on the basis of agreements achieved at the Paris CSCE summit in November 1990;

—have agreed on the following:

Article 1

The Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance signed in Warsaw on 14 May 1955 (henceforth Warsaw Treaty), and the protocol on extending the validity of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance signed on 26 April 1985 in Warsaw cease to be valid on the day the current protocol comes into force.

Article 2

The parties to the current protocol state that they have no claims at all on each other's property as a result of the Warsaw Treaty.

Article 3

1. The current protocol is subject to ratification.

2. The original protocol and the documents of ratification will be kept by the Government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. The Government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic will inform the other parties to the current protocol of the transfer of each document of ratification into safekeeping.

Article 4

The protocol comes into force on the day the last ratification document is handed over for safekeeping to the depository.

Made in Prague on 1 July 1991, in a single copy in Russian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, and Czech, with all texts being of equal validity. The Government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic will transmit to the other parties to the current protocol attested copies of the current protocol.

[Signed] For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, G.I. Yanayev, vice president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

[Signed] For the Republic of Bulgaria, Zhelyu Zhelev, President of the Republic of Bulgaria;

[Signed] For the Hungarian Republic, Jozsef Antall, prime minister of the Hungarian Republic;

[Signed] For the Polish Republic, Lech Walesa, president of the Polish Republic;

[Signed] For Romania, Ion Iliescu, president of Romania;

[Signed] For the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Vaclav Havel, president of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.

Committee Communique

LD0107183491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 1 Jul 91

["Communique of the Conference of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee"—TASS headline]

[Text] [no dateline as received] Communique

A conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw treaty member states took place on July in Prague. Taking part in it were:

—for the Republic of Bulgaria: Zhelyu Zhelev, president of the Republic of Bulgaria; Dimitur Popov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Bulgaria; Viktor Vulkov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Bulgaria;

—for the Hungarian Republic: Jozsef Antall, prime minister of the Hungarian Republic; Geza Jeszenszky, minister of foreign affairs of the Hungarian Republic; Ferenc Somogyi, state secretary at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian Republic;

—for the Polish Republic: Lech Walesa, president of the Polish Republic; Jan Krzysztof Bielecki, chairman of the Council of Minister of the Polish Republic; Krzysztof Skubiszewski, minister of foreign affairs of the Polish Republic;

—for Romania: Ion Iliescu, president of Romania; Petre Roman, prime minister of Romania; Adrian Nastase, minister of foreign affairs of Romania;

—for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: G.Y. Yanayev, vice president of the USSR; A.A. Bessmertnykh, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR;

[transmission interrupted]

The participants in the conference stated the following:

They agreed that the qualitatively new relations of good-neighborliness, partnership, mutual respect, and friendly cooperation between equal, sovereign states represented at the conference reflect the modern-day situation in Europe. Proceeding from this, they call for the development of ties in all spheres on a revitalized, bilateral, and legal-contractual basis.

They came out in favor of the further advancement of the all- European process in the interests of creating new structures of security and cooperation on the continent, in line with accords reached at the CSCE summit meeting in November 1990, and of the formation of an all-European framework for cooperation in the field of security, the economy, law, culture, ecology, and in the humanitarian sphere, as defined in the Paris Charter for a New Europe.

In the common view of the states represented at the conference, stability, well being and the further development of democracy based on respect for human rights and basic freedoms in the countries of Eastern Europe correspond with the interests of all states participating in the CSCE process.

The participants in the conference established the readiness of their countries to hold, should they be interested, bilateral or multilateral "ad hoc" consultation on topical issues representing common interests, including on issues connected with the fulfillment of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe.

They confirmed the provisions of the statement by the Warsaw Treaty member states adopted at the extraordinary conference of the Political Consultative Committee in Budapest on 25 February 1991.

Presidential Spokesman Holds News Briefing

LD0207191191 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 2 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich, Aleksandr Kanishchev, and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—A "very important" economic conference to consider results of the Soviet Union's social and economic development in the first six months of 1991 is under way in Moscow today, presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today."

The conference, attended by representatives of all republics, except for the autonomous republics of Adzharia (Georgia) and Nakhichevan (Azerbaijan), focuses on prospects for the second half of the year and measures to stabilise the Soviet economy.

The Soviet Union attaches great significance to the visit on Wednesday to the Soviet Union by President Carlos Salinas de Gortari of Mexico, Ignatenko continued. Moscow is looking forward to a free exchange of views with the Mexican president on a wide range of issues, while the two leaders will be able to adjust their evaluations of the situation in the world, trends and prospects for advance into a new epoch.

Speaking about the forthcoming brief working visit to the USSR by FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Ignatenko said that Gorbachev's meeting with the German leadership would take place in Kiev on July 5 and focus on a wide range of international issues, including the European process, and the forthcoming G-7 meeting in London.

"Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez will arrive in the USSR on July 8-9," Ignatenko said stressing that Moscow expects "a serious, substantive talk" during this visit.

Ignatenko dwelt in detail on the forthcoming G-7 meeting in London. In particular, he said that the Soviet president will arrive in London on July 16 and meet participants in the meeting on July 17. During his stay in London Gorbachev will have meetings with each of the seven leaders taking part in the conference.

Gorbachev plans to have a working breakfast with U.S. President George Bush to discuss issues on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Speaking about the Soviet president's first reaction to the statement announcing the creation of the Democratic Movement in the country, Ignatenko continued, Gorbachev emphasised that the movement unites forces aiming to forge accord in society and promote consolidation for the benefit of perestroyka and democracy. If all this coincides with the declared goals, it can only be welcomed, Ignatenko stressed.

Speaking about the situation in Yugoslavia, Ignatenko expressed hope that election of Stjepan Mesic to the post of Yugoslav president, who is also the Army commander-in-chief, would help attain stabilisation in the country.

The Soviet Union is for all Soviet-Yugoslav agreements, all documents relating to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to be fulfilled in full.

"The Soviet Union is prepared for the dynamic development of relations with Yugoslavia and giving Yugoslavia maximum friendly support," Ignatenko said in conclusion.

Moscow Economic Conference Noted

LD0207142691 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 2 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich, Aleksandr Kanishchev and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—A "very important" economic conference to consider results of the Soviet Union's social and economic development in the first six months of 1991 is under way in Moscow today, presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today.

The conference, attended by representatives of all republics, except the Autonomous Republics of Adzharia (Georgia) and Nakhichevan (Azerbaijan), is discussing prospects for the second half of the year and measures to stabilise the Soviet economy.

Today's session was opened by President Mikhail Gorbachev, Ignatenko said. Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov made a report. Debates on the report are currently under way at the conference.

Expectations for Meetings With G-7, Bush

LD0207153491 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 2 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—The Soviet president will arrive in London for the G-7 meeting late on July 16, Soviet presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing here today.

Gorbachev is expected to address participants in the G-7 meeting on July 17. Then he will have meetings with each of the seven leaders taking part in the conference.

As for his meeting with U.S. President George Bush, Ignatenko continued, it will take place during a working breakfast at noon on July 17 at the residence of the U.S. ambassador and last two hours.

The Soviet and U.S. presidents are expected to discuss a wide range of issues on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations. "Naturally, there will be a good chance in London to narrow differences on issues connected with the drafting of the START treaty."

It cannot be ruled out that some outstanding issues would be resolved there, he said stressing that Gorbachev had desire and political will to do that.

According to Ignatenko, the forthcoming meeting in London "does not lessen the need for a full-scale Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow." He expressed the view that "such a meeting will eventually take place in late July".

Ignatenko said "preparations" for the Soviet president's visit to Britain started today with a visit by economist Grigoriy Yavlinskiy to London, Bonn, Rome and Paris. He is going to meet leaders and statesmen in Britain, Germany, Italy and France, Ignatenko said.

Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Security Council, is to leave for Tokyo on Wednesday. On Thursday he will be received by Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu and Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama. Academician Leonid Abalkin is due to fly to London late this week, to be followed on July 14 by a team of consultants of the Soviet president, consisting of Primakov, Yavlinskiy, and First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov.

Democratic Movement Statement 'Positive'

LD0207143891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 2 Jul 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich, Aleksandr Kanishchev and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jul—The first reaction of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to the statement published on the establishment of a democratic movement in the country was to single out the aims mentioned in the document. This was stated at a briefing today by Vitaliy Ignatenko, aide to the USSR president and chief of his press service.

The head of the Soviet state, he said, drew attention to the fact that the movement is a union of forces directed at achieving accord in society and consolidation in the interests of perestroyka and democracy. If all this coincides with its declared aims this can only be welcomed, Vitaliy Ignatenko stressed. At the same time the chief of the president's press service expressed support for the accord [soglasiye] group which is being set up in the USSR Supreme Soviet and which pursues similar aims.

Commenting on the content of the statement by the Democratic Movement, Vitaliy Ignatenko also stated that the movement is not confrontational and is not acting as a faction within the CPSU but it invites all parties to cooperate. On the whole he judged as 'positive' the creation of the movement.

The creation of this movement was not unexpected by Mikhail Gorbachev, the USSR president's aide continued. However, the president could not be a consultant or adviser in the matter, Vitaliy Ignatenko stressed in conclusion.

Hope for Stability in SFRY

LD0207154291 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 2 Jul 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich, Alexander Kanishchev, and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—The situation in friendly Yugoslavia is taken close to heart in the Soviet Union, Soviet presidential spokesman, Vitaliy Ignatenko, told a briefing here today.

Commenting on the election of Stipe Mesic to the post of Yugoslav president, who is also the army commander-in-chief, Ignatenko expressed the hope that it would help attain stabilisation in the country. According to him, the presidium, while interacting with republics and union governments, will be able to create conditions conducive to the preservation of Yugoslavia's integrity and independence.

He drew attention to the nascent hope of the resumption of dialogue in the country. Such dialogue, Ignatenko continued, will help ensure a peaceful and democratic development of all nations of Yugoslavia.

The Soviet Union is for all Soviet-Yugoslav agreements, all documents relating to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to be fulfilled in full.

"The Soviet Union is prepared for the dynamic development of relations with Yugoslavia and giving Yugoslavia maximum friendly support," Ignatenko said in conclusion.

Gorbachev Looking to 'Different' Ties With G-7

PM2806093791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Ministers Rehearse": "Stop Press"]

[Text] In the context of the invitation for the USSR president to attend the G-7 meeting in London, Tuesday's conversation in the Kremlin between M.S. Gorbachev and Professor G. Allison of Harvard University, involving USSR Security Council member Academician Ye.M. Primakov and Soviet economist G.A. Yavlinskiy, aroused tremendous interest among journalists during a briefing in Moscow 25 June. V.N. Ignatenko, assistant to the Soviet head of state and head of the press service, pointed out that in preparation for the G-7 meeting M.S. Gorbachev is analyzing the program put forward by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the G.A. Yavlinskiy program prepared in conjunction with a number of Western specialists, along with the recommendations made by the IMF and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The two plans share very many elements, overlapping 90-95 percent, and "one cannot exist without the other."

Many questions touched on the president's participation in the G-7 meeting. It was noted at the briefing that M.S. Gorbachev is going to London to seek understanding of the Soviet reforms and strive to bring the USSR and the West to a new level of economic cooperation. This invitation for M.S. Gorbachev to attend the conference is only the first step in establishing large-scale ties between the USSR and the seven leading Western states. These ties are being established stage by stage. Depending on the quality of the ties in two or three years time it will probably be possible to talk about a different kind of status, if not a "G-8."

Correspondent on Gorbachev's 'Liberal Spring'

LD0107110491 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1715 GMT 30 Jun 91

[Comment by KOMMERSANT correspondent Maksim Sokolov; from the "Namedni" segment of "Author's TV"]

[Text] [Namedni host Leonid Parfenov] Today is 30 June, which means that in two weeks Mikhail Gorbahcev flies to London for the meeting with the leaders of the seven major Western powers. Some people believe that the Yazov, Pugo and Kryuchkov trio are holding Gorbachev by the arms and legs: others say that he has sold himself to the seven. But what about the big man himself? The past week gives grounds for thinking about what Gorbachev will take to London and what he will possibly bring back from there.

[Sokolov] In order to understand what awaits Gorbachev in London and what is to be expected of Gorbachev at home one should bear in mind the fact that taking part in the war of the laws in addition to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the supreme soviets of the republics is yet another supreme soviet, the most supreme of them all to judge by the extent of its influence upon the state budget of the USSR—I am thinking of the supreme soviet which is situated in the city of Washington and which is also known as the U.S. Congress.

On 19 June the U.S. Congress adopted a law under which all aid to the central Soviet government is banned until such time that it proves by its deeds and beyond all doubt that it is devoted to the defense of human rights, to free enterprise, and to the demilitarization of the national economy.

Immediately thereafter the USSR president displayed remarkable respect for the law. On 21 June he delivered the most liberal and radical speech of the whole of his political career. On 24 June, addressing graduates of the military academies, he called for radical military reform. On 26 June he condemned further provocations by the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachments] in the Baltic republics, saying that the time had come to put an end to this. Thus he speaks as a liberal across the whole front.

In explaining the causes of the liberal spring, it is worth using some popular analogies with events of 50 years ago. When the Anglo-American allies decided to give aid to the USSR during the summer of 1941 they feared most of all that the allies' equipment might fall into the hands of those into whose hands it should not fall under any circumstances, that is, the Nazi Wehrmacht. They sought guarantees that that would not happen. By all accounts Gorbachev's present trip to London also has as its main purpose the giving of such guarantees to the allies. Gorbachev will most likely travel to London to explain that Russia is still holding firm, that Western aid will not get into the hands of the Soviet Wehrmacht under any circumstances, and that in general Yazov, Kryuchkov, and Pugo will be broken and victory will be ours.

Gorbachev Meets Financial Company Chief

LD0107201191 Moscow TASS in English 1707 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev received in the Kremlin today Mr. Eisenberg, president of one of the largest financial corporations "Eisenberg Group of Companies." Gorbachev and Eisenberg discussed prospects for mutually advantageous cooperation in cotton growing, co-production of civilian aircraft and cooperation in some other areas.

Gorbachev Receives Western Businessman

LD2806225791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1817 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 28 Jun (TASS)—Today Mikhail Gorbachev met with one of the major representatives of the Western business world, Bruce Rappaport, who told the USSR president about his activities in partnership with Soviet colleagues and about his intentions to expand and improve them. The discussion touched on a broad range of current economic and political problems.

[Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 1800 GMT on 28 June, in a similar report, adds: "The USSR president instructed Comrades Shcherbakov and Velikhov, who took part in the conversation, to present specific proposals on the issues that had been discussed." The video shows Gorbachev seated across a table from Rappaport. Velikhov is briefly shown among those seated]

Army Paper Cites Churkin on PRC Border Issues

PM0307120691 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report on 27 June Moscow briefing by USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration chief V.I. Churkin: "Meeting With Journalists"]

[Excerpt] At a briefing in Moscow 27 June, V.I. Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, drew the attention of the press to the agreement signed 16 May between the USSR and the PRC on the Soviet-Chinese state border in its eastern section. As he said, reports have recently appeared in certain press

organs in which the facts and substance of the Soviet-Chinese talks on border issues are distorted, with USSR Foreign Ministry spokesmen being cited. It was stressed in this connection that the agreement is based on a principle that is generally accepted in modern international law (the principle of the main bed), along which, in a river, the border line runs.

It was announced that the agreement was signed only for the eastern part of the border. But a short sector remains, in the region of Khabarovsk, which has not yet been agreed upon. Work continues regarding the western section of the border. The agreement concluded is a success for both sides, which found mutually acceptable solutions on the basis of international law. It was noted particularly that representatives of the Russian Foreign Ministry and other republics took part in the final stage of the talks on border issues, and no objections or criticisms were raised by them.

Regarding items published in a number of regional publications speaking of the intention to "defend certain territories," the Foreign Ministry spokesman stated that this question "is to a great extent emotional in nature, and in this case is not entirely justified." Thus the fact that Damanskiy Island, with which the dramatic events of 1969 were associated, is to go to the Chinese side is mentioned in emotional terms. But in fact, Damanskiy Island has been under the control of the Chinese side for two decades. It cannot be said that this territory "is being taken away from the Soviet people who live and work there and handed over to China." The diplomat expressed the hope that common sense will prevail over emotion. [passage omitted]

UNSC Agrees on Iraqi Reparations, Weapons

PM2806100191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Union Edition p 11

[V. Lashkul report: "Iraq Delays Destroying Missiles"]

[Text] The question of Baghdad's payments into the special fund set up to provide compensation for the damage done by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait has provoked sharp debates in the UN Security Council. These debates flared up over Perez de Cuellar's proposal that compensation payments not exceed 30 percent of Iraq's revenue from exports of oil and petroleum products. It was primarily the U.S. stance that prevented agreement from being reached on a "ceiling" for reparations. Washington's representatives pressed for compensation payments into the special fund of up to 50 percent of the above revenue.

The deadlock on the problem forced the Americans to give way. During subsequent consultations the UN secretary general's proposal for 30-percent reparations won support. A draft resolution on this will be put to the vote at the Security Council Wednesday. In the opinion of experts, in two years Baghdad's receipts from oil sales may total $21 billion. If that happens, Iraq will pay up to $6.3 billion into the compensation fund annually.

The world community has outlined a plan for Iraq to destroy its mass-destruction weapons and missile hardware. This resolution was unanimously approved by the Security Council. Baghdad immediately said that it refuses to finance all the operations to destroy the aforementioned weapons. The United States has decided to allocate $2 billion for a special UN commission set up in accordance with Security Council decisions on settling the Gulf conflict. However, official U.S. State Department spokesman M. Tutwiler said that Washington has suggested that other states also fund this commission's activity.

The steps that the world community has taken are extremely topical in the light of recent reports of the UN special commission's checks on Iraq's Muthakhkhanah center that produced chemical agents. Despite massive bombardment of this area by U.S. and allied aviation in the course of the Gulf war, some chemical arms survived here. They pose a great potential threat, in particular, to the local population. In this connection the question of their urgent destruction has arisen on the agenda.

Luchinskiy Addresses Workers Movement Researchers

PM2106151391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the "News for the Edition" rubric: "Working People and Politics"]

[Text] The working class and scientific and technical progress, working people and politics—these and other topics were the center of attention for the participants in the Third International Forum of Workers Movement and Working Class Researchers. It opened in Moscow 19 June.

Addressing the forum's participants, P. Luchinskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, pointed out that during a period of profound transformations in society it is working people and their organizations that should play a crucial role in implementing socioeconomic and political reform and renewing Soviet society.

The country has encountered enormous difficulties today. But the situation is characterized not only by negative phenomena, constructive processes are also increasing. Our aim, P. Luchinskiy said, is to ensure that the move to market relations is regulated and accompanied by the creation of powerful systems of social protection ensuring that problems relating to employment, the normalization of the consumer market, and the stabilization of all society are resolved.

United States & Canada

Previews of Bush-Gorbachev Meeting

Bush Cited

PM0307093991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent V. Nadein: "G. Bush: I Look Forward to Meeting With Gorbachev"]

[Text] Washington—The White House has officially announced that a working meeting between U.S. President George Bush and USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev will take place 17 July in London. The meeting of the two states' leaders will be held after the end of the conference of heads of the seven most industrially developed Western countries, which will be held in the British capital 15 through 17 July, said a statement which Marlin Fitzwater, the U.S. President's press secretary, delivered in Kennebunkport (State of Maine), where Bush is on vacation.

U.S. President Bush believes that his upcoming London meeting with Gorbachev provides a good chance to narrow areas of divergence. "I eagerly await the one-on-one meeting with President Gorbachev," the U.S. leader stressed during a news conference held Monday.

Going by the schedule announced for the London meeting of the "big seven," Gorbachev and Bush will hold the conversation over lunch immediately after the end of the conference of the leaders of the United States, Canada, Japan, Germany, Britain, Italy, and France. In this way this dialogue is, as it were, placed outside the framework of this most important annual economic event.

However, it is clear from Bush's comments that following the dialogue between the two presidents "a wider meeting will take place with the participation of all of the 'seven.'"

Giving due attention to the Soviet leader's latest comments, the U.S. President rejected the conjecture by Western writers that Gorbachev is going "cap in hand" to London. "I am sure that he never intended to do that, and I do not think that even speculation on that topic, in the United States for example, has done him any good. I expect to hear from him about his plans for carrying out vigorous reform and for continuing the process of perestroyka and glasnost," the U.S. President said.

The question of granting the Soviet Union Most Favored Nation status in trade was raised during the news conference. In this connection the head of the U.S. Administration rejected any interconnection between a trade agreement and progress in talks on strategic offensive weapons. According to a comment by R. Gates, assistant to the President and deputy for national security affairs, who took part in this news conference, "insignificant technical problems" whose solution will not take much time lie on the road to a trade agreement.

Concerning bilateral relations, Bush said that his London meeting with Gorbachev does not lessen the need to hold a meeting in Moscow. "I want to spend enough time with President Gorbachev in order to discuss the most important problems in real depth," he said, noting that a two-hour conversation over lunch will clearly be insufficient to discuss questions of global significance.

Both in London and afterward in Moscow President Bush intends to make every effort to convince Gorbachev that the Soviet Union has "nothing to fear from us." This comment is by all accounts addressed not only to the Kremlin but also to Capitol Hill.

Although Bush expressed the belief with all certainty that Gorbachev does not intend to request "large financial aid," he has nevertheless cautioned against hopes of any unilateral actions. "The economic problems in the Soviet Union and everywhere in the world are so great that it is extremely important that we get as close to each other as possible in our concord," the U.S. President said during the news conference held at his Kennebunkport estate, State of Maine.

Commentary Views Talks

LD0207154191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] On the 17th of this month in London, where the leaders of the seven industrially advanced nations gather for a summit, there'll be a working meeting between the president of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States. What can the meeting produce? A view of our commentator Yuriy Solton.

The meeting will be short. As scheduled it will last for only two hours, but that doesn't diminish its significance at all. Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush are in permanent contact, exchanging messages and discussing arising problems over the telephone. Naturally, they are aware of views and options of each other, but nothing is better than a private conversation when, in a relaxed atmosphere, they can clarify positions and outlines decisions, if need be.

Notably, the two presidents will meet right after the summit of the seven nations' leaders, Mikhail Gorbachev will address on the same day. I think that before his speech he'll be interested in getting firsthand information about the views of the big seven, just as President Bush will be interested to hear the opinion of President Gorbachev about reforms in the USSR and about the possibilities of the Soviet Union's cooperation with Western nations. This fact alone, as I see it, confirms the trustworthy nature of the relations between the two leaders and their intention to keep following the path of

partnership. President Bush declared he was looking forward to the meeting with President Gorbachev. He told newsmen on Monday there were a number of global issues that had to be discussed. What is notable, President Bush underlined that on many problems the positions were identical.

I don't rule it out that the working meeting of the two presidents will stimulate the talks to reduce strategic offensive armaments of the two countries and will help to remove obstacles on the path of Soviet-American economic cooperation. According to President Bush, Washington was concerned to some extent over calls in the Soviet Union lately—especially among the military—to trust the United States less, to show caution in relations with it. President Bush said he wanted to convince President Gorbachev that the Soviet Union had nothing to fear whatsoever. I may add that the United States has nothing to fear from the Soviet Union either.

Naturally, the working meeting of the two presidents in London does not replace and does not cancel out the planned visit to Moscow by George Bush, which can take place at the end of this month. Anyway, the programs of the two presidents have three days for that. George Bush said he wanted to have enough time with President Gorbachev to carry out in-depth discussions of some issues. That was the main thing, he added. I may say the Soviet leadership has the same opinion.

Diplomat Previews Talks

OW0307053591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 2 Jul 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The brief working meeting between Gorbachev and Bush in London on July 17 will focus, first and foremost, on the prospects of integrating the Soviet Union into the world economy. A ranking diplomat from the Soviet Foreign Ministry's USA and Canada Department said on Tuesday that that would be just one in a series of such meetings Mr. Gorbachev would have with the G7 leaders. The Soviet and US presidents would also discuss preparations for their next summit in Moscow at the end of this month, when they would be expected to give a political impetus to action on the still unsettled problems within the framework of the START talks.

Petrovskiy Talks With U.S. Official

LD0207124691 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy and U.S. Assistant Secretary of State John Bolton met here on Monday and Tuesday to discuss the role the United Nations plays in promoting the new world order.

The sides noted with satisfaction increasing Soviet-U.S. Cooperation within the framework of the U.N. as was vividly reflected in actions by the U.N. Security Council and the entire international community during the Gulf crisis.

The sides believe that the U.N. with its peace-making potential sealed in its charter can play a central role in resolving complex regional conflicts. The search for Cambodian and Afghan settlements is currently taking place within the framework of the United Nations and preparations for new U.N. peace-keeping operations in Angola, Western Sahara and El Salvador are under way.

The two statesmen also discussed adapting U.N. activities to new world realities. They noted the increasing importance of upgrading coordination and cooperation with various organisations and agencies in the "United Nations family".

Commentary on Near East, Gulf Role of U.S.

PM0207115591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Yu. Glukhov: "Persian Gulf: Who Foots The Bill"]

[Text] A really curious event has occurred: The British defense ministry has presented a bill to the country's foreign policy department. The point is that around 300 British servicemen participated in the lavish parade organized in New York to celebrate the victorious war in the Persian Gulf. Their trip to the United States cost the British exchequer 100,000 pounds sterling. The military reckon that the diplomats should pay for the show.

But this is by no means the only account that is currently being settled in relation to the war in the Persian Gulf. We are talking about far bigger and more serious matters. Increasingly the question arises: Didn't Washington act too hastily and arrogantly by twice blocking emergency peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union?

I recall that as soon as he received the report on Washington's decision to start military action against Iraq USSR President M.S. Gorbachev proposed to U.S. President G. Bush that additional steps be taken—to secure through direct contacts with Saddam Husayn an immediate announcement of the withdrawal of his forces from Kuwait.

Later, the USSR made further efforts in an attempt to prevent the development of the war. As a result of the "Primakov mission" and the summit talks in Baghdad and Moscow, Iraq's agreement to immediately and unconditionally withdraw its forces from Kuwait in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 660 was secured. The path was opened to the transfer of the conflict into the channel of a political settlement. Obviously, the more speedily a peaceful solution was obtained, the fewer casualties and the less destruction

there would be. Each day was important. So what happened? Iraq's consent was obtained on 22 February, but it was not until April that a cease-fire eventually came into effect.

The settlement plan devised in Moscow was wrecked by the start of the multinational force's ground operation. At the time the USSR's efforts were given a distorted, propagandist slant in the West and, indeed, in some of our press organs. They were protrayed as a desire to "win the laurels of peacemaker," to reap the fruits of someone else's victory, to "save face" for Saddam Husayn, and so on. It was claimed that it was already too late to halt the flywheel of war.

It may seem paradoxical, but Washington's relish for force and the persistent U.S. efforts to rout Iraq ultimately played into Saddam Husayn's hands. According to our correspondent, who has visited Baghdad, Iraqis by no means blame their leader for the defeat. They believe that there could have been no other outcome in a conflict with the armies of some 30 states, but there was no capitulation either. Moreover, a nation and state's instinct for self-preservation is a factor. The uprising by the Kurds in the north and actions by the Shi'ites in the south spell disintegration for Iraq. Hence the commitment to strong central power. And this is what the existing regime actually has at the moment.

But let us return to the results of the protracted, orchestrated military campaign. According to the Greenpeace organization, between 100,000 and 120,000 Iraqi soldiers were killed and 300,000 wounded in the war... Civilian casualties amounted to between 5,000 and 15,000. Some five million lost homes or jobs. That was the price of the "easy" victory, paid for with the lives of 266 Americans. Losses on that scale could have been avoided if the war had stopped six weeks earlier, which was a realistic possibility.

The scale of the ecological disaster is well known. More than 500 flares blazed in Kuwait's oil fields. But how many of them started burning after 22 February? It is clear that the conflagration would have been much smaller had the hostilities not entered the concluding phase—ground fighting.

It was at the final stage of the war that the exacerbation of the Kurdish tragedy occurred. Some 1.5 million Kurdish refugees streamed into neighboring Turkey and Iran. Tens of thousands of them perished en route or in the camps. The Kurds' unsuccessful uprising was provoked by Washington's anti-Saddam rhetoric and left to the whim of fate. Indeed, originally, according to Kurdish leader Jala Talabani, the Kurds had decided not to participate in the conflict on the allies' side and had even suspended their own hostilities. "We were deceived by allied propaganda, which had exaggerated Iraqi losses," he said, explaining the Kurds' involvement in the carnage.

The actions by the Iraqi Shi'ites in the south of the country were provoked and doomed to defeat in exactly the same way. Both the Kurdish and Sh'ite problems were merely cards in a political game against the Saddam Husayn regime. They were immediately discarded as soon as Washington deemed it dangerous to continue the game. Indeed, the Kurdish problem spilled over into Turkey, Iran, and Syria, threatening to completely destabilize the region. The White House was also faced with scary prospects in the event of a possible victory in Iraq for the Shi'ites and their forming a bloc with Iran beneath the flag of anti-Americanism and Islamic revolution. Note what a sharp decline there has been in the United States in personal attacks on Saddam Husayn.

I cite all these facts not in order to rehabilitate the regime that committed aggression against Kuwait and flouted international norms and challenged the world community. It is necessary to learn lessons from the first major crisis since the end of the cold war. How effective were military means in resolving the conflict? Isn't an economic and political blockade preferable? Should the potential for a peaceful solution have been ignored, that is, by leaving the solution of internal issues to the Iraqis' discretion, including the settlement of accounts with the existing authorities?

There is yet another paradox. Operation "Desert Storm" was supposed to be the key to a Near East settlement, a kind of "open sesame" magic formula. At least, Washington was clearly hoping for a diplomatic success in the wake of military triumph. Not for nothing has U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker already made four trips to the Near East. However, they have all been fruitless. In my view, the reason for this is that the sides in the Arab-Israeli conflict are expecting entirely different things from the resolution of the crisis in the Persian Gulf zone and the muscle-flexing.

Take Israel, for example. It has adopted a hard line. Tel Aviv is against UN and PLO participation in a peace conference and is continuing to build settlements on the seized Palestinian territories. These actions have their own logic. The Arab world has been weakened. Iraq has been routed. The intifadah—the uprising on the occupied territories—is waning. The Palestinians are discredited and bereft of financial support. At the same time, U.S. influence and presence in the region have increased. It can frequently be heard that Kuwait and, indeed, Saudi Arabia and the emirates are actually "indebted" to Washington for their "salvation." In the Israeli leaders' opinion, this is a unique opportunity to dictate to the Arab countries their own terms for a Near East settlement.

The Arabs have a different logic. Not unreasonably they believe that strong-arm methods of influence must be universal and applied to any aggressor who ignores international demands, including Israel. They expect the United States to act accordingly.

The polarity of hopes and expectations is paralyzing U.S. Near East diplomacy. The United States has profound economic, oil, and financial interests in the Arab world,

and Washington is disinclined to risk them by pushing things too far. On the other hand, Israel is a U.S. strategic ally. The U.S. Administration is hardly likely to confront a traditional partner. Alas, Washington is more likely to go along with the Israelis on, for example, the question of excluding the United Nations from the peace process. It is reported that the Bush administration has assured Israel that it will veto any possible UN resolution concerning a Near East settlement while talks are being conducted on that question.

But all the same, how permissible are strong-arm methods of influencing the aggressor in the Arab-Israeli conflict? I believe that a repetition in the Near East of the Iraqi variant of crisis solution really must be ruled out. More than 100,000 dead and 100 billion [currency not specified] in military expenditure is too great a price to pay. This kind of "pacification" does not stand up to criticism either from the viewpoint of morality or from the viewpoint of general human values.

There is no denying that invaluable experience of political collaboration in crisis situations has also been accumulated within the framework of the UN Security Council. As a rule the council members are displaying a rare unanimity in their approach to the Iraq-Kuwait conflict. At the moment they are implementing decisions on monitoring the cease-fire, eliminating the aftermath of the Iraqi aggression, compensation for the damage caused, the disarmament of Iraq, and so on. My only fear is that events will get stuck in a groove, that Iraq will turn into a chronic trouble spot, like Lebanon. Even now there are just as many problems in the Persian Gulf zone as there were at the start of the crisis.

Against this background the state of euphoria caused by the success of U.S. arms looks like self-deception. But it is still there and has obviously gone to people's heads. The United States has adopted an unexpectedly schoolmasterly tone toward its European partners. Let me cite the U.S. NEWSWEEK magazine: "Washington's only certainty is that its leading role is still essential. The war in the Persian Gulf showed that Europe needs to go a long way before it can ensure joint actions, one senior U.S. figure stressed. Without us, it is simply incapable of providing leadership."

It appears that, having overcome the "Vietnam syndrome," certain people in the United States are again contemplating the role of arbiter of the world's destiny. At any rate, an element of this has crept into the lexicon of U.S. Near East diplomacy. "I do not suppose our adminstration has any significant role in mind for the Soviet Union, in fact," William Quandt, for example, said—and he is a well-known U.S. Near East specialist. Does this not explain the blocking of the aforementioned USSR peace initiatives? To what extent did the Near East meetings between Baker and Bessmertnykh alter this shortsighted U.S. approach?

But life itself is inevitably imposing amendments. It appears that the period of enthusiasm over the military success is coming to an end. As THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "For some Americans there is mounting alarm behind the patriotism and pride which characterized the parades in New York and Washington. They claim that the war in the Persian Gulf was not worth the loss of life and the other losses. According to them, it is unlikely to offer the possibility of the long-term peace in the Near East that Bush predicts." The search for peace lies ahead.

That is why, returning to the question of who foots the bill for the conflicts in the Near and Middle East, I believe diplomacy should pay. It is still in debt to a world public yearning for the long-awaited peace for which it has paid so much but which has not yet been realized.

Goskino Denies Complicity in Film Pirating

91UF0929A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 Jun 91 Union Edition p 4

[Letter to the editor from USSR Goskino Collegium Chairman A. Kamshalov, and members R. Bykov, V. Dostal, R. Ibragimbekov, O. Rudnev, V. Ryabinskiy, A. Fedorin, G. Chukhray, and K. Shcherbakov: "Will We See American Films?"]

[Text] Recently the Soviet and foreign mass media have been reporting a decision of the Motion Picture Association of American (MPAA) to refuse to sell its films to the Soviet Union and its republics and also to refuse to show them at the International Film Festival in Moscow.

The association's protest was directed against the illegal use of American films in our country on video equipment (video piracy). Referring to testimony from witnesses and materials from the Soviet press, the MPAA leaders point not only to the inaction of Soviet authorities with respect to this activity but also to the participation of Soviet state organizations in it, in connection with which the collegium of the USSR Goskino [State Committee of the USSR Council of Ministers for Cinematography] considers it necessary to make the following statement.

The collegium completely agrees with the opinion of the MPAA regarding the essence of this problem. The scale of video piracy in the USSR causes deep and justified concern both among the creative intelligentsia and in Soviet organs for state management of cinematography. The moral, financial, and political harm caused to Soviet citizens and the state, cinematographic art in our country, and also foreign copyright holders is immense. During the period of transition to market relations, previous devices for fighting against illegal use of audiovisual works are no longer effective and new ones have not been developed yet.

At the same time the USSR Goskino cannot agree either with the assertion of the association's leaders regarding the participation of state movie organizations in the

illegal use of video copies of American films for commercial purposes or the passivity in solving this problem that has been ascribed to it.

A significant obstacle in the fight against video piracy is the country's lack of adequate legislation or specific mechanisms for applying it, about which the USSR Goskino has repeatedly informed its American partners, including MPAA members. At the same time the USSR Goskino always has been and still is a supporter of having the USSR subscribe to the Bern copyright convention as soon as possible.

During past years the USSR Goskino, within the limits of its authority, has been taking steps directed toward placing unregulated video rentals on a civilized basis. With the committee's immediate and active participation, a draft has been prepared for making changes and additions to the section of the Fundamentals of USSR Civil Legislation ("Copyright" section) and bringing it into line with the norms of international law.

On the initiative of the USSR Goskino, the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 12 April and the instructions of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers of 7 May 1991 have been prepared and adopted. They have to do with establishing a state register of audiovisual works, keeping a list of all movie and video films and video programs that are being shown publicly in the country, and also developing provisions for public showing of audiovisual works. The drafts of these documents are intended to be instruments for protecting property rights and they will be submitted for government consideration in the near future.

Assessing the situation that has developed, the collegium of the USSR Goskino declares its desire to wage, within the framework of the law, an uncompromising battle against illegal commercial use of audiovisual products. While sharing the concern of the American movie industry association and respecting its right to determine independently the methods of solving this problem, the collegium expresses doubt that the method of action selected by the MPAA will accelerate the normalization of the situation in this sector of Soviet-American cinematographic relations. And this is by no means a matter of a lack of a constructive approach on the part of the USSR Goskino: We are all witnesses to the intensive legislative activity in our country and we hope that in the near future the turn will come for the laws that are the subject of the concern of the cinematographers.

The collegium of the USSR Goskino hopes that the Motion Picture Association of America will pay attention to the objective realities of all the processes taking place in the USSR and will continue our joint work to eliminate the obstacles in our business collaboration. Significant aid in this matter in particular could be rendered by American experts—consultants in fighting against video piracy, whom the Americans promised to send to the Soviet Union in 1988.

Air Route Opens Between Anchorage, Magadan

OW0307073191 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 0930 GMT 25 Jun 91

[Video Report by V. Gerasimov on new Anchorage-Magadan air route; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our air links with the United States are developing successfully. A month and a half ago our aircraft flew to Miami, Florida, for the first time, and now the links with our eastern regions are developing successfully—a Boeing belonging to the American aviation company "Alaska Airlines" landed in Magadan for the first time. [Video shows the airliner touching down, the reception party welcoming passengers, the president of "Alaska Airlines" talking to Gerasimov]

[Begin recording] [Gerasimov] This flight opened a direct air route from Anchorage, the biggest city in Alaska, to Magadan. The airliner covered 3,600 kilometers in three hours 40 minutes. It delivered a large group of senators and businessmen from the state of Alaska, as well as U.S. and Canadian tourists, to Magadan.

The northerners welcomed the guests with truly Russian hospitality. Raymond Vecci, the president of "Alaska Airlines," was presented with bread and salt, and Vyacheslav Ivanovich Kobets, Chairman of the Magadan Oblast Soviet, presented him with a symbolic key to the city on the shore of the Okhotsk Sea, and expressed satisfaction with the opening of a direct air bridge between the neighboring states across the Bering Strait.

Lately, business contacts between Magadan Oblast and Alaska have been developing rapidly. Joint Soviet-American enterprises work in Kolyma and Chukotka; cultural exchanges, cooperation between scientists, and tourist trips are on the increase.

Raymond Vecci, the president of the "Alaska Airlines" aviation company shared his impressions of the flight. He expressed satisfaction with the realized agreement and said that the new airline will help establish ties between the native peoples of Alaska and Siberia, and will also offer unique tourism opportunities to people interested in the Arctic and the Soviet Far East.

I can only add that there will be three flights a week, the ticket price is $550 and there are plans to sell some of the Magadan-Anchorage round trip tickets for rubles.

China

Report of Jiang Zemin Meeting With Polozkov

PM0207080391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent B. Barakhta under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Beijing, 30 Jun—Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, has received a CPSU delegation headed by I. Polozkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee.

During the talks Jiang Zemin stressed that the development of friendly, good-neighborly relations between the Soviet Union and China is in line with the interests of stability and peace worldwide.

I. Polozkov conveyed greetings to Jiang Zemin and other Chinese leaders from M.S. Gorbachev. In his turn, the general secretary of the CPC Central Committee asked for greetings to be conveyed to M.S. Gorbachev and the entire Soviet leadership.

Polozkov Reviews China Trip

LD0207104391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] Beijing 1 July—I.K. Polozkov, head of the delegation of Russian Communists, member of the Politburo of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] CP Central Committee, who was in China from 20 through 29 June, was interviewed by TASS correspondent Vladimir Kashirov.

Q: What were the main tasks of your delegation's visit to China?

A: The further expansion and deepening of Soviet-Chinese inter-state, inter-regional and inter-party ties. The current trip by our delegation must be regarded in the context of the earlier visits to the PRC by M.S. Gorbachev and A.I. Lukyanov, V.A. Ivashko and other Soviet party and state leaders.

China, a neighbor of the Soviet Union, is a great power not only in terms of population numbers, but also in terms of its huge economic, scientific and technical and cultural potential. Our two states have the longest land state frontier in the world. Of the 7,500 km of joint frontier more than 4,000 km is with the Russian Federation. Therefore the RSFSR and the USSR as a whole have very broad prospects for the development of mutually advantageous cooperation with the PRC, first and foremost in the trade and economic sphere, on Union and republican levels.

Since a large part of the territory of Russia is in Asia, the study of the experience accumulated by China during the years of reform is of special significance for the Russian CP. Thus the frontier krays and oblasts of the RSFSR have a great deal in common with the northeastern provinces of the PRC, where we spent a few days. Hence the important task of studying the experience of a neighboring friendly country, of attentively looking for everything that is of use to us, and of getting new contacts going, including on a party course. The topical nature of this task is growing particularly at the present time when our local bodies of authority, the different industrial trade enterprises, the agricultural collectives, the economic and trade associations are receiving increasingly greater freedom and independence.

The CPSU and the Russian CP have proposed a socialist choice, and we shall firmly try to vindicate this path of development. The Chinese CP and the Chinese Communists are also full of resoluteness to try to vindicate and improve socialism. They have their own thoughts and directions, we have our own, but our aims are the same. As far as the diversity of forms and methods of socialist transformation is concerned, this does, in my opinion, mutually enrich the Soviet Union and China.

Q: What aspects of the Chinese experience of reform appeared to you to be the most interesting and useful?

A: Above all, I would like to stress that China has traversed a path of active transformations and reforms with major social shocks and explosions. That predetermines all the rest. Naturally, complicated dramatic situations arose in this country in the course of the reforms, and now there are quite a few extremely acute problems needing to be resolved.

At the meeting with the general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, Jiang Zemin stressed that thanks to the reforms China had managed to resolve a far from simple task to provide the country's 1,100 million population with food, footwear and clothing and to establish order in a society where people live and work in tranquility.

In a short time, China was able to curb the inflation that is characteristic of all countries, especially in critical transitional periods. It is universally known that major capitalist states such as France, Germany and the United States have also experienced such economic shocks, including the swift growth of inflation.

Whereas in 1988 the level of inflation in the PRC was 18 percent, in the current year it has decreased to 3 percent. In developing a planned economy, the Chinese are at the same time, without sensation, outcry and hullabaloo in public awareness, mastering market relations and creating special economic zones, developing private trade, the service sphere and boldly starting lease relations. Life will show the fate of these experiments, especially in agriculture.

I would like to note one extremely substantial detail. The Chinese leaders have reexamined their views and reassured public consciousness with regard to the historical events, long ago and recent, in the country. Every state, depending on its social system, experiences shocks, exaggerations and distortions in its development. Today the Chinese are convinced that one has to have a respectful attitude to history.

Time puts everything in its place, places its own accents, but the main thing is not to make a fuss about individual episodes in history. It does not need touching up, you see. The next generations will start to remove the

retouching all the same. In the Soviet Union we set about painting over our history in a different color, we concentrated public awareness on the fact that everything in our country was bad, that we purportedly had nothing at all and were going nowhere. I am convinced that our children will get to the bottom of this, will understand where the truth is and where there is a life. However, something else worries me—the attempts to undermine people's belief. That is the most frightening thing.

A calm, restrained position and precise, consistent work in all directions—this I think is the only correct path. Only when people know the aim of the transformations, when they are sure that they and their children will be socially protected and provided for, albeit with the minimum, only under this condition will society be able to develop stably. It is precisely the existence in China of a specific aim for the development of society that made such a great impression on me.

Let us look in various countries of the world for everything that is acceptable and useful for our country. If we build our domestic and foreign policy in such a way, we shall move forward in our development. Let us not interfere in the internal affairs and problems of other states, let them resolve these for themselves. We must constantly bear in mind that foreign countries will only give us help on condition that we ourselves work well and make skillful use of useful foreign experience.

Q: This is your first visit to China. What are your most vivid impressions of what you have seen in this country?

A: As a person who has spent many years working in agriculture, I would like to emphasize two points. First, the Chinese people's friendly attitude to us. We sensed this and saw it in people's eyes everywhere that we went. This goes to show that the years of alienation and of tense relations between our two countries have not managed to eradicate from the awareness of the Chinese and Soviet peoples the feelings of friendship and mutual respect and, I would say, of spiritual kinship for each other. In Beijing and during the tour of the northeast PRC, we had many meetings and conversations with ordinary toilers and with leaders at various levels. All of them recalled with warmth the years of friendship between China and the Soviet Union, and expressed a sincere readiness to develop cooperation with us in all spheres. Second, the members of our delegation were pleasantly surprised at the cleanliness of the towns and countryside. Everywhere we saw well worked, well looked after fields with rice, wheat, corn and other crops. In the markets and shops there was an abundance of the most varied foods. I will not venture to make judgements about prices, that is another matter. After all, China, too, is undergoing a transitional period.

In conclusion, I would like to speak about the Chinese people's caring attitude to cultural monuments, to traditions and customs. We were also struck by the broad sweep of construction. Since 1979, a great number of industrial enterprises, first-class hotels, sports complexes and houses have been erected in China, and modern paved highways, intersections and overpasses have been built. It was very pleasing to see with our own eyes the great successes achieved by China in the years of implementation of reforms and of openness to the outside.

Correction to Report on Polozkov Beijing Arrival

WA0307113191

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Polozkov, Delegation Arrive" published in the 21 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 9: Column two, sixth full paragraph, fifth sentence, make read: ...suitable for us. It is my belief that imposing pro-Western economic concepts wholesale on the Soviet Union at this time would get us nowhere. This is why... (supplying dropped sentence).

CPSU Anniversary Greetings to CPC

PM0207080191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[CPSU Central Committee Secretariat greetings message, date not given: "To the CPC Central Committee"]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

On the 70th anniversary of the formation of the CPC we send the Central Committee and all CPC members our cordial congratulations.

We wish Communists and all PRC citizens new achievements in socialist building, the successful fulfillment of the large-scale programs for the country's modernization, and progress on the path of reform and renewal.

We are convinced that the further strengthening of friendly and equal relations between our countries and parties in the spirit of the accords reached during the Soviet-Chinese summit in Moscow in May 1991 are in line with the vital interests of our country's peoples and, in the global political context, are having a positive influence on the shaping of the situation in the world. Soviet Communists intend to continue making their weighty contribution to building up the potential of good-neighborliness, friendship, and cooperation between our countries' peoples.

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat

Commentary on PRC Accession to Nuclear Treaty

OW0207073591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1000 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Commentary by Observer Viktorov]

[Text] During his formal visit to Japan, Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen said that China will be able to accede to the treaty of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons in the near future. In this connection, station observer Viktorov writes a commentary, saying:

Being able to accede to the treaty does not mean China will definitely do it. I feel that this statement by the Chinese foreign minister is logical in a sense, considering China's stand on the important issue of nuclear disarmament.

Over the decades, China has abandoned many of its dogmatic and belligerent policies, and become one of the active and prestigious participants in international talks on nuclear disarmament. For instance, in the Asia-Pacific region, China supports the movement for establishing a nuclear-free zone. After acceding to the Rarotonga Treaty for banning the deployment of nuclear weapons in the South Pacific, China expressed its conviction that the realization of that treaty is favorable to peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region.

Besides the Soviet Union, only China has promised not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Until recently, many observers had linked China's stand toward the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons to Soviet-U.S. antagonism in the Asia-Pacific region. Now some obvious progress has been made on this issue. The Soviet Union has unilaterally begun to reduce its troops and armaments, including those in the Asian part of the Soviet Union.

The United States also has decided to reduce its military presence in the southern part of the Korean peninsula. Not long ago, the Soviet Union and the United States accomplished for the first time in history the task of destroying a whole category of short- and medium-range missiles, including rockets capable of carrying nuclear warheads. This actually means the realization of a situation of zero option on the European and the Asian Continents. This point was formally demanded by the Chinese representative at the 1988 UN General Assembly session.

Recently, during the formal visit to the Soviet Union by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the PRC's Central Military Commission, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out that the Soviet Union and China, as permanent members of the UN Security Council, are charged with special responsibility for safeguarding peace. In consideration of the trend and logic of contemporary international developments, China is joining the 118 signatories to the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. This will be an important contribution to the further improvement of the international climate.

Deputy Defense Minister Completes Visit to PRC

PM0307094791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Visit Concluded"]

[Text] The official visit to the PRC by a delegation from the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services headed by Army General V.M. Arkhipov, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services, ended 25 June.

The delegation was in the PRC at the invitation of Colonel General Zhao Nanqi, chief of the Chinese People's Liberation Army Rear Services Main Directorate.

Chinese Tug, Barges Dock in Komsomolsk-na-Amure

PM0307114591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 91 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Port Expected Its Guests"]

[Text] Komsomolsk-na-Amure, 30 Jun—A foreign ship moored for the first time at the cargo dock in the river port of Komsomolsk-na-Amure today. The Chinese tug Longgui-604 was delivering on two barges from Harbin a large consignment of bricks for the brickworks being built with PRC participation in the eastern sector of the Baykal-Amur Main Railroad.

Some 5 million bricks will be delivered under contract during the current shipping season. A number of the city's enterprises have also concluded contracts with PRC firms for the shipment of various kinds of output. For their part, the Maritime Kray working people will be sending timber, rolled metal, mineral fertilizers, and other output to China.

The port of Komsomolsk-na-Amure has been preparing to receive foreign ships since last year. New berths have been fitted out and rail tracks extended. Customs posts and a border checkpoint have been opened.

Sino-Soviet Talks on Worker Exchange Held

OW0207062091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] China's Deputy Foreign [Economic Relations and Trade] Minister Wang Wendong arrived in Vladivostok on Monday to discuss with the Soviet Deputy Employment Minister Yevgeniy Katulskiy the prospects of employing Chinese citizens for work at Soviet enterprises and associations.

An appropriate agreement was signed by the two governments in 1989, but a number of corrections and amendments have been inserted into it ever since.

Dalai Lama's Visit to Ulan-Ude in Doubt

OW0207062191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Dalai Lama's scheduled visit to the Soviet Union for celebrating the 250th anniversary of the official recognition of Buddhism in Russia may not take

place. The invitation to take part was sent to the Buiddhist primate by the USSR Central Buddhist Board which is opening the festivities in Ulan-Ude, Buryatia, at the end of July.

Soviet diplomats maintain that the Dalai Lama's visit may cause dissatisfaction on the part of the top leadership in Beijing and thus damage the newly normalized Sino-Soviet relations. This is seen as the main reason behind the Soviet Union's procrastination about the granting of entrance visa to the prominent religious personality. Similar considerations disrupted the Dalai Lama's visit to Mongolia recently.

IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent notes that the arrival in Moscow of the Dalai Lama's personal envoy has so far failed to get action on the existing problems.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shenin Meets With SRV Party Leaders

LD2906054991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1324 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By correspondent Aleksandr Denisovich]

[Text] Hanoi, 28 Jun (TASS)—Constant strengthening of friendship and all-round cooperation with the USSR is the strategic line that will be adhered to by communists and all the Vietnamese people. This was said by Do Muoi, general secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, at a meeting here today with a Soviet party delegation headed by O.S. Shenin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. At the invitation of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, the delegation was taking part in the work of the seventh congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam, which ended yesterday.

Do Muoi stressed that despite a whole series of serious problems to resolve both in Vietnam and in the Soviet Union, and certain difficulties that have arisen in the course of economic contacts between the two countries, we are sure that relations between the SRV and the USSR will continue to develop on the basis of mutual benefit. An example of this are the links established by Vietnamese entrepreneurs with several enterprises and organizations in Uzbekistan that are persistently seeking ways to strengthen cooperation and are finding them.

On behalf of communists and all the Vietnamese people, Do Muoi wished the Soviet people new success in implementing perestroyka within the framework of the socialist option.

On his part, the head of the Soviet party delegation gave a frank account of the political and socio-economic situation in the USSR. He described the efforts being made by the country's party organizations to stabilize the situation. He underlined the importance of strengthening relations of friendship and cooperation between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Vietnam, and expressed certainty that they will continue to exert an important positive influence on the broadening of all-round links between the two countries.

Reportage on Cambodian Peace Accords

Official Says Accords 'Very Positive'

OW0107092891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1615 GMT 28 Jun 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report by Igor Porshnev, diplomatic correspondent: "Cambodia: Syncronisation of External and Internal Aspects of Peace Settlement"; transmitted by KYODO]

[Text] A ceasefire agreement has gone into effect in Cambodia since June 24 following a meeting in the Thai city of Phatthaya by the Supreme National Council involving all of the four of the country's warring groups. An official of the Soviet foreign ministry's department for the Far East and Indochina countries told an IF [INTERFAX] corespondent that the agreements reached were very positive. Until more recently, he said, searches for a Cambodian settlement were carried out externally, mostly by five permanent members of the Security Council and member countries in the Paris conference on Cambodia. It looked at if the Khmers themselves had been left outside the process; because of internal rifts they had failed to set up a Supreme National Council.

The Soviet diplomat said a meeting in Jakarta early this month between Prine Norodom Sihanouk and Prime Minister Hun Sen became a watershed. There were further searches for compromise in Phatthaya which culminated in the adoption of a final communique.

The Soviet diplomat said further progress could be expected by the Khmer groups involved in the conflict. However, syncronisation of the processes of internal and external settlement, he said, is the key issue on the agenda. The diplomat expressed apprehensions that without international guarantees any Cambodian settlement would be fragile. As for the Soviet Union, he said, it is always ready to be involved in all patterns of cooperation for a Cambodian peace settlement.

Commentator on Accords

BK0207081191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1230 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Commentary by Radio Commentator Aleksey Kondratyev]

[Text] Last week a piece of good news was heard from Phatthaya, Thailand, where the meeting of the Supreme National Council of Cambodia [SNC] was held to enable warring Cambodian factions to work out a formula that would allow them to make political concessions to each other for the sake of finding a solution to their conflict.

Concerning the decisions adopted by the SNC in Phatthaya, our commentator, Comrade Aleksey Kondratyev has the following comment:

The above-mentioned piece of news surely inspires us with hope. The opposing Cambodian factions agreed to continue the cease-fire and to stop receiving foreign military aid. That was good news. Every SNC member agreed to let Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, the leader of the Khmer opposition groups, play the role of organizer and chairman of future SNC meetings, where the question of how the cease-fire should be monitored by the United Nations will be discussed. And it was also decided that the SNC will set up its headquarters in Phnom Penh.

Certainly, all these agreements will not immediately undo all the knots of the Cambodian problem. Nevertheless, in my opinion, the factions have finally learned to start dealing with the knot that should be tackled first: I mean the decision to hold fire for a moment and to stop receiving foreign weapons from now on. My guess is that what has made them take that decision is their realization that the question of internal power can never be settled on the battlefield. After 12 years of continuous fighting, all Cambodian factions, so it appears to me, seem to have been saturated with that realization.

Certainly, all Cambodian factions still have to overcome many hostile feelings and differences that have been piling up over the years, and they still have to solve countless complex problems. These include the implementation of the UN peace plan on Cambodia, involving the dissolution of the armed groups, the holding of general elections, the prevention of the genocidal regime's recurrence in the country, the determination of the country's future, and many other issues. However, for all these things to come into being, it is necessary first of all to bring about peace. And it is in this direction that the first step has been made in Phatthaya.

Personally, I think that there is another question worth mentioning: It is no secret that the Cambodian conflict has been clouded with the mist of the Cold War. It not incorrect to say that Washington, Moscow, and Beijing have confronted each other in Indochina. It was certainly from these capitals that the warring groups in Cambodia received arms, aid, and other kinds of support; and such a situation still remained true just recently, despite the fact that the Soviet Union, the United States, and China last year joined hands in elaborating the UN plan for the settlement of the Cambodian problem.

Just a few days ago, the representative of the Soviet Foreign Ministry announced Moscow's readiness to join other states in promising to halt the dispatch of arms to Cambodia. It was expected that Beijing and Washington would support this initiative. Otherwise, military confrontation would return to Cambodia.

Near East & South Asia

Resolutions on Iraq Program To Be Observed

OW0307034691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 2 Jul 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report]

[Text] The Soviet Union will undertake to comply with the United Nations resolutions on settling the crisis in the Persian Gulf if it makes sure Iraq has secretly worked on nuclear weapons of its own.

DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent quotes officials at the Middle East and Northern Africa Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry as saying Iraq is expected to fully abide by UN Security Council Resolution 687, which stipulates, among other things, that Iraq must ensure that international inspectors be freely admitted to its nuclear and other military installations. The Soviet Foreign Ministry, wishing to base its stand on specific data, is waiting for the UN Secretary General and IAEA's current mission in Iraq to announce the findings of its inspection. Should Baghdad's suspected involvement in nuclear weapon development be confirmed, the USSR would proceed not from the interests of the early re-establishment of its cooperation with Iraq, but rather from the will of the international community which is urging Baghdad to create all the necessary conditions for a peaceful settlement in the Gulf.

Commentary on Unpredictability of Saddam Husayn

LD0207170291 Moscow Radio Moscow in Arabic 1600 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] A special UN delegation has visited Iraq. It arrived in Baghdad to express the Security Council's concern about the Iraqi authorities' abstraction of the UN observers' work inspecting Iraq's capabilities to produce nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. All these technologies must be destroyed according to the Security Council resolution which Iraq agreed to.

Our commentator Yuriy Solton analyzes this question:

The behavior of Iraqi president Saddam Husayn is totally unpredictable. The man who kindled the fires of the war and brought harsh calamities and problems on his people is once again behaving in a challenging manner. They did not allow the UN observers to inspect the nuclear installations which although they were bombed during the war, they could still contain, it is presumed, equipment and sets which could be used to manufacture nuclear weapons. The last incident of this kind took place last Friday. At first observers were not allowed to visit a plant near Baghdad. A short while later nearly 100 large trucks left the plant. When the observers tried to stop them to inspect the cargo the Iraqi soldiers fired warning shots.

However, President Saddam Husayn, as was pointed out, belatedly issued an order not to hinder the UN observers from doing their jobs. However, what are the chances of believing his words? This is not an easy matter. Lifting economic sanctions depends on how honest Baghdad is to the UN Security Council resolutions. Moreover, the Iraqi authorities by violating the UN resolutions could provoke a new outbreak of military operations. Although the U.S. President has said he prefers putting diplomatic pressure on Iraq, he does not exclude, simultaneously, the possibility of using U.S. aircraft and warships to strike blows on Iraq's nuclear installations. It does not need a lot of speculation about the depressing consequences which this action could lead to whether to Iraq itself or to the Middle East peace process which is planned with such difficulty. However, we still hope that the UN delegation will be able to persuade the Iraqi Government of the necessity of complying with the Security Council's resolutions meticulously both in spirit and to the letter.

Full Ties With Israel Said 'On the Agenda'

OW0307071091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 2 Jul 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The question of the full normalisation of Soviet-Israeli relations is on the agenda. This announcement was made by a member of the Middle East and North Africa section of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union. In conversation with DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent he said that the Foreign Ministry is considering the problem of setting up full diplomatic relations with Israel in the context of the broad national interests of the USSR in the Middle East. This means that not only the wishes of Israel itself are being considered, but also the possible influence on relations between the Soviet Union and a host of Arab nations.

According to the diplomat it is now clear that it is more advantageous to have diplomatic channels than to break them completely. The break in Soviet-Israeli relations in 1967 bears testament to this fact. Of course, he went on, that incident had its reason - the occupation of Arab territories by Israel. These territories are still under occupation, a situation which is hampering the establishment of full diplomatic ties.

In addition, the process to reestablish relations has been going on actively for the last three or four years. This includes dialogue on Middle Eastern questions and mutually advantageous bilateral relations in scientific, technological, economic, trade and other spheres.

The diplomat also pointed to the presence of "major humanitarian problems" linking the two countries. This means most of all the great number of Soviet Jews emigrating to Israel. We have a good basis for relations with Israel, said the diplomat. He also mentioned the fact the Soviet Union was one of the countries to vote for the creation of the State of Israel. All this, he went on, makes the question of the establishment of diplomatic relations a very topical one. However, he emphasised, we see it as a part of the movement to establish a truly peaceful order in the Middle East.

CPSU Delegation Meets Yasir 'Arafat in Tunis

PM0307105991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 91 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Seeking Ways Toward Dialogue"]

[Text] The CPSU delegation headed by Yu.I. Zuyev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, which is in Tunisia at the invitation of the PLO, met Saturday with Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee. In talks held in a friendly atmosphere they discussed problems linked with the search for a just settlement to the Near East conflict and a solution to the Palestinian question.

Cooperation Protocol With Tunisia Signed

PM0307103991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS report: "Tunisia-USSR"]

[Text] The fifth session of the Soviet-Tunisian Intergovernmental Standing Commission ended in Tunis Saturday with the signing of a protocol on economic, scientific, and technical cooperation and trade for 1992. Eight projects, including the Sedzhunan River Dam and the Sidi-el-Barrak hydro complex are currently being implemented in Tunisia with Soviet assistance. Four Soviet-Tunisian joint ventures in the trade and industry sphere are currently in operation.

Lukyanov Meets Sri Lankan Delegation

91P50240A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS: "Communique"]

[Text] On 27 June, USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A.I. Lukyanov met with a delegation of the Sri Lankan parliament, headed by parliament speaker, M.H. Mohamed; the parliamentary delegation was in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

Bombing Shows Lax Afghan Border Security

PM0107145391 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No. 24, Jun 91 (signed to press 10 Jun 91) p 7

[Article by Marina Shakina under "Emergency Situation" rubric: "Returning Bombs"]

[Text] The incident involving the bombing of a Tajik village near the border has been explained. Apologies and commiserations have been received. That makes everything all right?

Bombs were falling on Soviet Union territory for the first time since the end of the Great Patriotic War. The village of Namadguti Poyen, near the Soviet-Afghan border on our side, in Tajikistan, was attacked from the air. Four bombs exploded and killed four villagers, wounding another ten. After that the plane pulled out. No one tried to stop it.

The bombing took place on the fourth anniversary of the Matthias Rust flight, but somehow you don't feel like making snide remarks on the subject. Rust's "childish stunt" could have ended tragically only for him, but the Afghan "buzzing" of the Tajik village resulted in precision bombing—and the result is there for all to see. This time the Defense and Foreign Ministry information services must be given their due. A fully acceptable explanation was given the following day: An Afghan Air Force pilot, flying from Kabul to attack mujahidin positions near the Soviet border, lost his bearings and carried out his combat mission on our territory. At the same time, the Air Defense Command claimed, Soviet airspace was not violated, and as for bombs being dropped several kilometers inside the border—these things happen, apparently. So the Air Defense Troops were not to blame, the Border Guards even less so—they are responsible only for the ground surface and the area above it up to the height of the border watchtowers. But all the same, it is impossible to believe that everything is all right. Even if this was an accident which no one—not just our Army, criticized from all sides—could have foreseen.

The Afghan plane was difficult to identify because it was one of ours—a Soviet plane: a SU-25 ground-attack aircraft. And the aviation bombs were ours, Soviet. The civil war in Afghanistan has been continuing since our departure, and we continue to participate in it with arms, equipment, and food deliveries, justifying this by saying that we need political stability in a country that neighbors ours. The Soviet Union has delivered to Afghanistan: 56 SU-22 planes in the period 1979-1990; 60 SU-25's in 1986-1990; 53 MIG-23'sin the last two years; and, according to unconfirmed data, a certain quantity of MIG-29's in the last year. Afghanistan accounts for 13 percent of our arms exports to the Third World. It is the third-biggest consumer. And now this desire for stability has revealed to us a quite unexpected side—the return of Soviet aviation bombs.

The question is apparently exhausted—there has been an explanation, apologies and commiserations have been received, and even the "democratic press, which is sensitive to such incidents," as the saying goes, has not managed to raise an especially big fuss. Forgotten within a week? All the same, the incident will hardly pass without leaving a trace, having forced us to remember the Afghan War and the aid which we are giving to the Kabul regime. Will the same not happen as happened with Iraq, that with our own hands we will have armed a monster? It will be "good" (although what sort of good!) if we can get away just with accidents like the one in Tajikistan—only four casualties. By inundating Afghanistan with weapons, we are increasing the danger of any kind of accident—of our weapons' falling into the hands of the mujahidin, who are not so friendly to us; of bombs flying over the border onto our side; of a civilian plane being shot down by our own rockets, and God knows what else besides!

The off-course Afghan pilot reminded us about the Afghan War and our current participation in it. The deaths in Tajikistan are a consequence of continuing fratricide in that neighboring country, and we are supplying one of the sides with military hardware. However long we put it off, this problem will have to be solved—and perhaps very soon.

It is simply impossible not to compare the incident in Tajikistan with what the Soviet Armed Forces are doing in Lithuania and Azerbaijan and with what is said on television screens about the Army's role. Some generals are convinced that the Army will sow, winnow, and reap the harvest. And what about its constitutional duty—to defend the fatherland and the population from outside encroachment?

There was unrest on the Soviet-Afghan border throughout the time of our presence in Afghanistan—bombardment of our territory from that side and border crossings were nothing unusual. Today, two years after our withdrawal from there, the region continues to remain unstable: The Afghan border approach roads are the province of the mujahidin. Quite an alarming picture is emerging for our border troops. It would seem that this situation is a sufficiently weighty ground for showing increased attention to that section of the border and programming our defense to deal with accidents. However, the incident in Tajikistan testifies to something else. It is surprising, after all, that the bombs were brought to us by the pilot of a friendly regime which we instruct and advise and with which we coordinate actions, maintain the closest military contacts, and develop military cooperation. Maybe our military should not be diverting themselves too much with the problems of internal politics but should rather be worrying about this: If we are going to be teaching foreigners to fly, and in our planes too, shouldn't we be doing it properly?

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Discusses ANC National Conference

MB0207182291 Moscow Radio Moscow in Afrikaans 1700 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Commentay by Aleksandr Fedorov—read by announcer]

[Text] The national conference of the African National Congress [ANC] opens soon. An ANC spokesman made the following comments during a news conference: A new statute will be adopted at the conference and a new National Executive Committee will be elected. More than 2,000 delegates from 850 branches will participate in the conference. At the conference 55 members including the president, the secretary general, and their assistants will be elected to serve on the National Executive Committee.

From these factual statements can one possibly come to the conclusion that the ANC is being torn apart by a struggle between the older members and the youth, or that the South African Communist Party [SACP] is trying to increase its hold on the ANC? Can one even assume that the reason for these planned reforms within the ANC is prompted by certain family problems experienced by certain leaders of the organization?

These are the unbelievable conclusions arrived at by political commentators of the THE STAR and the SUNDAY STAR newspapers. It is also unbelievable that trustworthy people are being influenced by these statements. Well-known Cape political scientist Herman Guilomee wrote the following in a recently published article: The government is concerned by ANC policies and believes that the ANC is really too weak to become the pillar of reconstruction in South Africa. Fedorov believes that Guilomee has accurately stated the main reason for the ongoing propaganda campaign against the ANC.

The ANC has already been accused of so many misdeeds: an unwillingness to meet with other black leaders involved in the negotiation process; unrealistic and dangerous plans for restructuring the South African economy; and today, on the eve of the conference, it has been accused of all the deadly sins.

The increase in the campaign against the ANC is being blamed on the ANC-SACP alliance. The first person who called on this organization to distance itself from the SACP's conservative ideas was Mr. Pik Botha, the South African foreign minister. This call was abruptly reiterated by Defense Minister Magnus Malan. I doubt that these ministers were not aware of the decision by the U.S. Congress to halt financial aid to organizations linked with the SACP. Now they regret the move because the 27 million rands would have been used by the ANC to assist in the transition from an underground movement to a political movement with wide support.

Fedorov does not believe that the propaganda campaign which has been planned so meticulously is having the desired effects, although it is understandable that it is not easy for the ANC to fight against shrewd opponents after 30 years as an underground movement. This organization has had to fight against apartheid since its inception and does not have time to defend itself. Only the ANC has the right to decide with whom it wishes to form an alliance. This will most likely be discussed during the upcoming national conference at the beginning of July.

We will not be too hasty, however, with our assumptions. There is enough of that in South Africa today. It is a pity that assumptions are not always based on facts or a desire to achieve peace in that country.

CPSU Greets ANC National Conference

LD0207100191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2126 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 2 July (TASS)—The Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee has expressed "willingness to continue and to strengthen the long-standing friendship and cooperation between the CPSU and the ANC [African National Congress]" in a telegram of greetings to delegates of the national conference of the African National Congress of South Africa. The telegram, circulated here today, states that the opening of the conference is "a result of the selfless struggle of the people of South Africa, under the guidance of the ANC, for the elimination of apartheid, and of the broad international support for this struggle and the actions of realistically minded circles of the RSA". The conference opens today.

Statement on S. Africa Nonproliferation Decision

PM0107152291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed item from IZVESTIYA, news agencies roundup: "USSR Foreign Ministry Statement"]

[Text] The Soviet Union greets with approval the South African Government's decision to adhere to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The hope is expressed that the process of formalizing South Africa's membership of the treaty will be completed without further delay.

This step by the South African Government is assessed as a manifestation of political realism. It confirms once again the dynamic and effective nature of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the international regime formed on its basis; an effective and lasting system of collective security is inconceivable in the modern world without the strengthening of that regime.

Ethiopian Political Crisis Analyzed

91UF0924A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[Article by V. Korovikov: "Ethiopia—What Lies Ahead?"]

[Text] The crisis of the military-totalitarian regime in Ethiopia had been dragging on for several years. There was no end to the exhausting, protracted civil war, the

economy had been destroyed, and the peasantry had been impoverished, and it constitutes almost 90 percent of the population. The approach of catastrophe was also recognized by the military group headed by Mengistu Haile Mariam, which had ruled since 1974. A variety of maneuvers and reforms, both political and economic, was undertaken to obtain military and financial support from outside in order to revive business activity. But it was too late—the regime was doomed.

And still the denouement came surprising suddenly. On 21 May Mengistu Haile Mariam left Addis Ababa and flew to Zimbabwe. And exactly a week later columns of insurgent detachments entered the Ethiopian capital. Power switched to the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF)—the largest anti-Mengistu grouping originally based in Tigray Province. There was no serious resistance. A brutal clash flared up only around the presidential palace. Several hundred persons perished. In the final days the capital was shaken by powerful explosions of munitions dumps, of which there were many in the capital.

And it is almost a month now that real power in Addis Ababa has been in the hands of the EPRDF. Its general secretary is the 36-year-old Meles Zenawi, a native of the northern city of Adua and former medical student at Addis Ababa University. He was a founder of the Tigrean Marxist-Leninist League—the forerunner of the Tigrean People's Liberation Front. Meles Zenawi is holding official news conferences, meeting with foreign ambassadors, explaining his policy, and giving assurances that his Marxist enthusiasms are largely a thing of the past. He is promising to abide by the policy agreed at the end of May in London on the formation of a multiparty transitional government by 1 July, to draw up a new constitution within a year, and to hold general democratic elections.

Events will show whether this scenario is realized. The situation in Ethiopia remains hard to predict. It is chock-full of urgent acute problems. Some seven to eight million people are starving and in need literally of nourishment being sent in daily. The situation in the semi-desert Ogaden in the southeast of the country is particularly serious. Congregated there are approximately one million refugees from Somalia where the military regime of General Siad Barre, which was very similar to the Ethiopian regime, collapsed at the beginning of the year, and the country has yet to extricate itself from the devastation and anarchy,

In addition, the fall of the Mengistu regime and the disintegration of his half-million-strong army (the biggest in Africa) have engendered a new wave of refugees in Djibouti, Sudan, and Kenya. Dozens of camps of Ethiopian POW's who surrendered to the insurgents in Eritrea, Addis Ababa, and elsewhere have appeared. Millions of people have found themselves without shelter, work, and means of subsistence.

Nor is everything straightforward in Addis Ababa itself. Although yesterday's guerrillas have behaved with discipline and have emphatically put a stop to the pillaging of looters and criminals, their arrival has evoked no rapture among the population. Many EPRDF detachments entered with red flags depicting the AK-47 Kalashnikov assault rifle, which, following 17 years of brutal rule by the extreme-left military regime, by no means engendered joyous emotions and associations. In addition, many of the guerrillas were peasant boys of the Tigrean national group, while the majority of inhabitants of Addis Ababa are Amhara and Oromo (Galla). The long, centuries-old traditional rivalry of the Amhara and Tigre (more precisely, their ruling elites) for supremacy in Ethiopia was in the same way reflected negatively in the attitude toward the armed newcomers. It should not be forgotten that thousands of people from nobility and monarchical circles, major landowners who lost their estates in 1975 following the radical land reform, and considerable numbers of the old, court functionaries and their descendants live in Addis Ababa. Not that much time has elapsed since 2 September 1974, the day of the overthrow of Emperor Haile Selassie I. And, of course, these people were expecting another type of "liberator"—without red banners and the Maoist-Stalinist slogans frequently employed by the leaders of the insurgents both in Tigray and in Eritrea.

There were turbulent demonstrations at the university and the U.S. Embassy. Stones were even thrown at the latter for it was believed that the seizure of the capital by EPRDF detachments and the transfer of power to them in Ethiopia had been sanctioned by the Americans. The demonstrations were broken up, and people were killed and wounded. It is now relatively calm in the capital.

The provisional government has by special decree disbanded the Ethiopian Workers Party and declared the army demobilized. Several thousand servicemen, government officials, and party functionaries have been arrested. It has been declared that their trials will be public with the presence of foreign legal experts. The new authorities have demanded that the president of Zimbabwe hand over Mengistu Haile Mariam to them.

But particular anger and rejection are being evoked in the capital by the insurgents' attitude toward the Eritrean problem. The EPRDF cooperates closely and fought together with the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF), whose main goal is the detachment of this province (which was an Italian colony from 1890 to 1941) from Ethiopia and proclamation of its independence.

The Eritrean problem is a most painful one for Ethiopians. It was from here that the colonialists' campaign on Ethiopian soil began. The search for Eritrea's reunification following the rout of the Italian fascists in 1941 was long and persevering. Only in 1952, in accordance with a decision of the UN General Assembly, was the Federation of Ethiopia and Eritrea created. But 10 years later Haile Selassie I unilaterally liquidated the autonomy of

this province, converting it into a regular province. And then the armed struggle of the Eritreans began. It was stoked in their own interests by certain Arab regimes. The conflict intensified, claiming increasingly new casualties.

The military regime did away with the monarchy, but largely continued the imperial traditions in respect of the national and ethnic groups (and there are more than 80 of them in Ethiopia). The state arrangement was strictly unitary and centralized. In the 1970's neither were the Eritrean leaders, for their part, greatly in search of peace and accord with the center. As a result, a 30-year war! And what is its result, what lies ahead? The Eritreans have a big score to settle with the army, and the list of casualties on both sides is long. Nonetheless, the country's division is rejected by the majority of Ethiopians for it would threaten the loss of an outlet to the sea, the tearing away of the economically most developed part of the country, and new interethnic conflicts.

There are more than enough disagreements and arguments on both the Eritrean problem and on many other most important political and economic issues among the dozen various groupings which fought against the ousted regime. The EPLF has already adopted a particular position. Its leader, Isaias Aferwork, by no means aspires to join the central government but has formed his own and is demanding a referendum under UN observation on the independence of this province. According to a Reuters report, a shipment of fuel has been detained in the port of Aseb, where the sole oil-distillation plant is located. In keeping vitally necessary petroleum products under their control, the leaders of the Eritrean separatists are hoping to secure the fulfillment of their demands at a national conference scheduled in the next few days. And the plant itself has now been stopped. Inhabitants of nonindigenous nationality are being deported from Eritrea.

The disagreements on national and religious grounds, particularly between Christians and Muslims, are strong also. Approximately one- third of the 50 million population of Ethiopia belongs to various clans and tribes of the Oromo (Galla) people in the central and southern provinces. Their militant organization, the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF), has its own action program, which is very different from that of other groups. Their arguments with the EPRDF are being manifested even now.

Even more serious news is coming from Gojam and Gonder—the historical center of Ethiopia. Open protests against EPRDF rule and against the separation of Eritrea and for the unity of the country and the interests of its most populous people, the Amhara, are starting there.

Nor should Ethiopia's millennial monarchical and religious traditions be forgotten. The Democratic Union, which was formed back in the 1970's in West Europe and the United States by the heir to the throne, the eldest son of Haile Selassie I, most likely will soon be stirring itself into action. Some members of the family of the last emperor are in Addis Ababa on the grounds of the British Embassy. An "empire white guard" is operating actively in the United States. The Ethiopian emigre community numbers over 100,000 there, and among them are many important politicians, military figures, businessmen, and scholars who left Ethiopia after the ouster of the monarchy. A "Coalition of Ethiopian Democratic Forces," which is making active preparations for a struggle for power in its homeland, emerged in the United States not that long since. Considering the role of American diplomacy and U.S. economic assistance in the creation of the new political structures of Ethiopia, the chances of a restoration of the monarchy in the new confrontation which is unfolding cannot be ruled out.

One thing is obvious—Ethiopia will have to endure yet another difficult period of its long, arduous, and frequently tragic history. The sole hope is that the bitter experience of the past decades of fratricidal discord and wars and the new peaceful international situation (and Ethiopia's troubles were organically connected to a large extent with colonial seizures, fascist aggression, and the rigid confrontations of the "cold war" of the superpowers) will help the healthy forces of the ancient country find positive solutions of the acute problems.

All of Africa has an interest in such an outcome of the perennial crisis. After all, Addis Ababa is in a sense the symbolic center of the continent. The Organization of African Unity was born and has been operating here for almost three decades, and the UN Economic Commission for Africa works here. Now both these important organizations are virtually paralyzed. Let us hope for good news from Ethiopia and a return to common sense, the peaceful life of the 50 million-strong people and the stabilization of one of the most ancient states on earth.

USSR Ready To 'Cooperate' in Ethiopia

PM0307095191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

["Statement by USSR Foreign Ministry Representative"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] As has already been reported, a national conference on settling the internal situation in Ethiopia, intended to put forward ways to resolve by peaceful and political means the problems confronting Ethiopia, is opening in Addis Ababa on 1 July of this year.

The conference organizers invited a wide range of representatives from the international community to participate in it as observers—all the permanent members of the UN Security Council, the OAU, neighboring African countries, and a number of other countries. The Soviet delegation has already flown out to the Ethiopian capital. We hope that by combining the efforts of all the conference's Ethiopian participants, and with the foreign observers' active collaboration, the forum which is being convened will succeed in achieving its main goal of

reaching an agreement on the structure of representative organs of power in a transitional period on the basis of national accord.

At the same time, we understand that forthcoming conference is but the first step on the complex and lengthy road to national reconciliation and stabilization in the country. The Soviet Union is ready to cooperate constructively with all those sincerely interested in the speediest establishment of lasting peace in Ethiopia, an end to the conflict, and the normalization of the situation in the Horn of Africa as a whole.

East Europe

Situation in Yugoslavia Reported

PRAVDA Report

PM0107133191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 91 Second Edition p 6

[Editorial commentary: "Conflagration in Central Europe"]

[Text] The first day of July usually marks the start of the mass tourist season on Yugoslavia's Adriatic coast. The freeways to the coast are jam-packed! Cars of various types and colors bearing license plates from virtually all over Europe head south en masse. For Yugoslavs it is a time for an intensive foreign-currency harvest.

But the country's roads today are deserted and alarming. Television has shown us terrible pictures. Tanks roam the highways. Downed military helicopters are burning on the ground. There are soldiers in helmets and flak jackets firing live rounds. The conflagration of civil war is breaking out in Central Europe.

The reaction to events in the SFRY is that the world has been shaken and is trying to understand and comprehend what has happened and assess the consequences. Opinions mostly coincide about the main point. The unilateral step by Slovenia and Croatia, which have announced their secession from the SFRY, could set off a powder keg and lead to civil war. The Soviet Union considers the existence of a unified, independent Yugoslavia to be an important element for stability in the Balkans and Europe as a whole.

We have all witnessed the way in which the development of events in Yugoslavia has paved the way for this explosion. And this multinational federal state has been hit by the virus of separatism—a disease which has now turned into an epidemic.

The SFRY Constitution grants republics very extensive autonomy—of the kind which we in the Soviet Union are only just contemplating with difficulty and with considerable costs. But even this autonomy, as Yugoslav practice has shown, does not in itself guarantee the stability and durability of the union within a federal framework. It is being undermined by the protracted economic crisis, separatism, and the inability to rapidly and effectively resolve the problems that arise.

Moreover, separatism in Yugoslavia has been deprived of its main opponent—the counterweight in the shape of the LCY [League of Communists of Yugoslavia]. This party advanced and upheld program goals common to all the country's peoples, and opposed any manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism. But because of its internal weakness and serious mistakes the LCY has collapsed, disappearing from the political scene as an integrating force.

Separatism in Yugoslavia is increasingly becoming extremist in nature. New leaders have emerged who are vigorously and doggedly working toward the collapse of the federation. Various states and leading international organizations have advocated the preservation of a united Yugoslavia. Nonetheless, the Slovenian and Croatian authorities took no account of this.

Certain observers are noting the influence of the "Baltic factor" on events in Yugoslavia. Clearly, there are certain grounds for such an assessment. The Slovenian and Croatian authorities have been prompted to take these extreme steps, which are currently alarming the world's public, by the position adopted by a number of Western politicians who, on the one hand, loudly advocate the USSR's preservation as a unified state, while, on the other, supporting the Baltic leaders' separatist aspirations in one form or another. Is this the kind of two-timing approach that the Yugoslav separatist forces are counting on?

The main thing now is to stop the bloodshed in Yugoslavia. A hopeful report came in from Belgrade Friday. Following a directive from the SFRY Federal Executive Council (Government), the Yugoslav People's Army announced an end to its military activities in Slovenia. The way seemed open to dialogue and a political resolution of the problems that had emerged. But the latest information from Yugoslavia, which we are printing today, shows that the situation continues to deteriorate.

Where there's life there's hope, as the saying goes. Peace in Yugoslavia is attainable. And peace—even a fragile and uncertain peace—is better than automatic fire or tank maneuvers.

Commentary Notes 'Deep Concern'

LD0107142991 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Commentary by Aleksandr Pogodin]

[Excerpts] Aleksandr Pogodin comments on the events in Yugoslavia, and their impact on the all-European situation:

Reports coming from that country show how very unstable the situation there is. It changes practically every day. Accordingly, hopes for political wisdom and common sense of the parties to the conflict that world

public opinion cherishes, alternate with deep concern over the fate of peace, and not only in Yugoslavia but on the entire European continent.

And it's not only the frequently made parallel with the year 1914 when the Balkan conflict sparked off World War I that matters in this case. It's obvious that the virus of separatism that (?has sparked) the current crisis in that country is not only a typically Yugoslav feature. It is a grave problem for many countries, including the Soviet Union, and some countries of western and eastern Europe.

When analysts here assess the Yugoslav situation, they proceed from the assumption that the existence of a united and independent Yugoslavia is an important element of stability on the Balkans and in Europe as a whole. A democratic and mutually agreed-upon settlement and the normalization of the situation can be achieved, in the opinion of Moscow, by the Yugoslavs themselves through a peace dialogue and steps taken toward each other. [passage omitted]

Members of the European Community are making their own contribution to the solution of the conflict. Its representatives are now engaged in active mediatory efforts aimed at achieving a settlement of the crisis.

I'd like to underline at this point that any international effort, individual or collective, should be subject to the aim of ensuring, in cooperation with the Yugoslav Government, necessary conditions for maintaining the country's independence and integrity.

Latest reports from Yugoslavia give (?us), it seems, reason for certain optimism. This is, first of all, an agreement on unconditional ceasefire, a three-month-long moratorium on the decisions proclaiming independence of Slovenia and Croatia, and the election of Stipe Mesic, a representative of Croatia, chairman of the country's Presidium.

It remains to be seen, however, how firm these agreements will turn out to be. Whether they will have a logical continuation on the way to a settlement or, on the contrary, the fragile balance will be upset, and will give way to a new outbreak of violence.

Expert on 'Acute Conflict'

OW0307053991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 2 Jul 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A Soviet Foreign Ministry expert on Yugoslav affairs, Vladimir Romanov, maintains the increasingly acute conflict in Yugoslavia may afflict both that country's own future and stability in Europe as a whole. He said in an interview with DP [Diplomatic Panorama] that for the first time since the late 19th—early 20th century the Balkans seem to be turning into a "gunpowder barrel" under Europe. Unless the conflict is effectively curbed, it may lead to really tragic consequences, apart from ceasing to exist as a single country. Yugoslavia may be swept by a civil war that may be extremely difficult to stop. Mr. Romanov views it as a big trouble for the Yugoslavs and all Europeans if another hotbed of tension emerges on the continent.

As he described the Soviet Union's stand on the matter, the Foreign Ministry expert said: "Moscow has always been in favor of Yugoslavia's unity and territorial integrity. That country's people must have the right to independently decide their future and develop their state system." He called for settling the conflict politically, through a dialogue between all parties involved. According to Mr. Romanov, "there is a real chance of settlement now, which it would be an unforgivable mistake to miss."

Belgrade Correspondent on Situation

LD0207171991 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] There are the first signs of normalization taking palce in Yugoslavia, but the situation there is still tense. These details from our correspondent in Belgrade.

The first days of the week have been encouraging. First of all, because of the election of the new chairman of the country's Federal Presidium. This event was long awaited by Belgrade's residents due to an interruption for a month and a half in the work of the Yugoslav collective Presidency. The Croatian Stipe Mesic has become the chairman. He said directly after his election that the Army should be excluded from the political life of the country. The crisis can be solved only by political means, he said.

And the political means seem to have started to work. The country's premier, Ante Markovic, held urgent talks with the leadership of Slovenia and has coordinated the question of returning the units of the Yugoslav People's Army to barracks. The Republics of Slovenia and Croatia have decided to suspend for three months their decision to implement independence. Thus there is a partial implementation of the conditions suggested by the delegation of the European Community to stabilize the situation. Today there will be a meeting between the German foreign minister, Genscher, who is in Belgrade for a goodwill mission, and the leaders of Slovenia and Croatia.

In short, politically we can say that there's the light at the end of the tunnel. But local reports say there is no truce yet. At night in the Croatian city of Vukovar on the Danube there was a real battle with the use of automatic guns and mortars. So far it is not yet established between whom there was this exchange of fire which was stopped after the intervention of the People's Army. The capital of Slovenia, Ljubljana, looks like a city under siege. Air

raid signals were sounded which resulted in local residents leaving their homes to protect themselves in air raid shelters. It seems that the city is empty and the soldiers of the republican self- defense forces search occasional passers-by. According to the Supreme Command of the Yugoslav People's Army, Slovenian paramilitary units do not carry out the ceasefire agreement. They are really hunting for the servicemen of the People's Army and their families. It was noted that the Army sustained most losses after the cease-fire agreement was reached. It seems that understandings reached in the offices do not yet guarantee the long awaited truce.

Report on CSCE Reaction

OW0207045291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 1 Jul 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report by diplomatic correspondent Pyotr Vasilyev: "CSCE Emergency Mechanism Is at Work in Yugoslavia"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A number of countries in the CSCE Conference aised a question of using the newly-set up mechanism of consultations and cooperation in respect of emergency situations following heightened tension in Yugoslavia after two of its republics, Croatia and Slovenia, adopted declarations of independence. An emergency meeting is to be held in Prague on Wednesday by the comittee of senior officials.

The procedure consists of two stages: The first one involving a question by a number of countries to a nation state on whose behalf the committee is to be called and a formal reply from that state has been completed. A formal request was sent by a group of 12 countries and an appropriate answer received from Yugoslavia; and the second one involves the calling of an emergency session to discuss the information obtained and work out recommendations.

The Soviet delegate in the committee of senior officials, Mr. Yuriy Deryabin, said the Soviet position was uneqivocally in favour of maintaining Yugoslavia's unity and integrity. "We are calling for all controversial isues to be resolved politically," he said. "Our position shares much in common with that of other countries, including the Council of Europe and the United States."

Mr. Deryabin said most of the committee members seem to favour the continuance of Yugoslavia as a single state.

Foreign ministers of CSCE countries at a recent meeting in Berlin passed a special resolution voicing unanimous support for Yugoslavia to be held in one piece.

On his country's attitude to the conflict in Yugoslavia, Mr. Deryabin said "We intend to stress at the meeting the importance of observing the principle of noninvolvmeont in a country's internal affairs." The Soviet diplomat also said that the resolutions by the committee which is planning to discuss the Yugoslav issue must not be out of line with the interests of wishes of Yugoslavia itself.

This will be the first time that the mechanism of emergency situations is used. However, its decisions are not legally binding, nor can it impose any sanctions. The mechanism was not conceived as an instrument of pressure but as a possibility for cooperation and joint searches of balance of interest by all 35 countries. Mr. Deryabin believes if the committee comes up with proper recommendations that can help resolve the crisis in Yugoslavia peacefully, it will have done its job.

RSFSR Official Comments

OW0207085691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 1 Jul 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report by Mikhail Mayorov: "Ambartsumov About Developments in Yugoslavia: Human Rights Take Precedence Over a Nation's Right to Self-Determination"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "Human rights must be above a nation's right to self determination," said deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs and Foreign Economic Ties Yevgeniy Ambartsumov in his comments on the latest developments in Yugoslavia. According to him, there is no hard-and-fast line between the guilty and the innocent, given the situation in the country.

On the one hand, back during WWII the puppet Croatian state led a bitter struggle against Serbians and residents of Montenegro who formed the bulk of the guerilla movement. Ustashi terrorists killed some of the leading politicians who had advocated a collective security system with the participation of the Soviet Union back before the war.

On the other hand, Serbians became Yugoslavia's dominant nation that infringed on the rights and dignity of other nations. According to the RSFSR deputy who is a politologist, Serbia wound up to have a stronger link to Stalinism, pseudosocialist concepts and to become a brake on the road to democracy.

According to Ambartsumov, important as the right of each nation to self-determination is, it is imperative now for all participants in the Yugoslav conflict to listen to reason and realize that individual rights take precedence over all other matters. The RSFSR deputy says that this is a lesson not only for Yugoslavia but also for the USSR where the situation is much the same.

Yanayev, Bessmertnykh Continue Prague Visit

Meet With Havel

PM0207142791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline: "Meetings in Prague"]

[Text] Prague—On 30 June Vaclav Havel, president of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, received G. Yanayev and A. Bessmertnykh.

G. Yanayev conveyed to V. Havel a message from USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev.

During the talks both sides emphasized their intention to bring relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia up to a qualitatively new level with due regard for the profound changes occurring in the two countries and in the light of the advancement of the all-European process. The conclusion of a new basic Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty, in whose elaboration a good start has been made, will be an important step. Given the political will, rapprochement is to be sought on the remaining points.

Meet With Romanian Leaders

LD0207142591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline: "Meetings in Prague"]

[Text] Prague, 1 Jul—USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev and USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh had a meeting here this morning with President Ion Iliescu of Romania, Prime Minister Petre Roman, and Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase.

The talks were devoted mainly to questions of bilateral Soviet-Romanian relations. There was a specific exchange of information on the nature of the present stage of the transformations being implemented in the USSR and Romania and on the measures in the socio-economic sphere which are being taken to ease a number of the negative consequences for working people.

There was a detailed discussion of the state of trade and economic ties between the two countries, in whose development there exists an enhanced mutual interest under conditions of complementary economic structures. The existence of a number of promising projects, whose realization would eliminate the acuteness of certain problems, was noted.

Further on Meeting With Romanian Leaders

LD0107161791 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 1 Jul 91

[By correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague July 1 TASS—Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev and Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh met here today Romanian President Ion Iliescu, Prime Minister Petre Roman, and Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase.

The conversation focused on the main issues of bilateral Soviet- Romanian relations. There was held a substantive exchange of information on the current stage of transformations, carried out in the USSR and Romania, measures in the socio-economic sphere aimed at alleviating the negative consequences for the working people.

The two delegations discussed in detail the two countries' trade and economic relations, noting that in conditions of complementary economic structures the USSR and Romania are interested in developing them. Note was taken of several promising projects which can solve a number of acute problems.

Depart Prague for Home

LD0107175191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1721 GMT 1 Jul 91

[By correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague, 1 Jul (TASS)—The USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev, who participated in the last conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, left Prague today for home. He was accompanied by Soviet Foreign Minister Aleskandr Bessmertnykh and other officials.

Yanayev was seen off at the airport by Zdenek Matejka, CSFR deputy minister of foreign affairs, Boris Pankin, USSR ambassador to CSFR, and Rudolf Slansky, CSFR ambassador to the USSR.

Gorbachev, Hungary's Goncz Exchange Telegrams

LD0107164491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow 1 Jul (TASS)—Arpad Goncz, president of the Hungarian Republic, has expressed sincere gratitude to Mikhail Gorbachev in connection with the completion of the Soviet troop withdrawal from the territory of this country. "The period between the end of the war and the start of your activity, which is determined political processes, meant years of stagnation, cold war, atomic silence, and nuclear peace," states the telegram circulated here today. "But today one country that has taken the path of democracy is saying farewell to the soldiers of the army of another country that has taken the path of democracy." The Hungarian president expressed the hope that "the forthcoming years will be for the peoples of both countries years of genuine peace, of European unity and democracy."

Mikhail Gorbachev, expressing sincere gratitude to the Hungarian president for his thanks, noted in a return telegram that "now that the last Soviet soldier has returned home, we can state with satisfaction that an immense and most difficult task has been carried out. It needs to be completed by reaching agreement on a fair sale of the property of Soviet troops left in Hungary."

Mikhail Gorbachev again stressed that "the Soviet leadership firmly intends to build relations and develop cooperation between our countries on the basis of trust, good-neighborliness, equality, and mutual benefit for the

purpose of strengthening stability and peace on the continent, and of consolidating international security."

CSFR Indignation at Yazov Interview Cited

PM0207162991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent L. Kornilov: " 'It Was Not an Invasion.' On an Interview in Czechoslovak Newspaper"]

[Text] Prague—An issue of the Czechoslovak newspaper LIDOVE NOVINY has published an interview which Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, granted to J. Stetina, its Moscow correspondent. The minister's replies are noted for their frankness, laconic brevity, and straightforwardness. I consider it my duty to report equally frankly on the way these thoughts and formulations have been perceived here, in Czechoslovakia.

Alas, they have been perceived negatively. I could say more—with indignation. I am speaking both of ordinary people and of statesmen. And people are calling and writing to the IZVESTIYA correspondent's center. Of course, the indignation does not apply to those replies of the minister relating to Colonel Alksnis' statements, the completion of the Soviet troop withdrawal from the CSFR, or his attitude toward the conflict in the Transcaucasus.

No, the Czechoslovak public is concerned about something else: the assessments of the notorious events of August 1968. Here is what Yazov said to the correspondent:

"In 1968 there was a different situation, different problems. Different assessments were made of the situation in the USSR and Czechoslovakia. There was a different regime, and the Communist Parties played the leading role—both in your country and in ours. Today some people speak of an invasion. I am categorically against this. It is possible to speak of an invasion when resistance to it has been organized. This was not an invasion, for the troops went in with the leadership's consent. Whether the country's leadership represented the people is another matter.

"No one fired on anyone, and the situation was normalized a few weeks later, and relations with the Soviet Army soldiers who were in Czechoslovakia temporarily—and we always emphasized that this was temporary—became very close. We have much in common—we are Slavs..."

And again—in reply to another question as to whether there are any forces in the USSR which would like to return troops to the CSFR:

"How could the Army return tomorrow? Even in 1968 it did not come until it was invited: After all, Havel and the government are now trying to ascertain who invited the Army... I do not know. In 1968 I was commanding a division in the Transbaykal region. I learned from the newspapers about the troops' being sent in. Who invited whom is, I would say, your affair. You yourselves must investigate this, at home in Czechoslovakia."

Why did these words of our minister elicit a negative response in the CSFR? And from everyone, including the majority of Communists? Above all, because not one legitimate state organ—neither the president, nor the National Assembly, nor the government—ever invited either the Soviet Army or any other army into this country. The Communist Party's leading role? But the army was not invited by the Czechoslovak Communist Party either—not that it had such a right. This is an elementary, well-known fact, and it is strange not to acknowledge it in 1991. Such a failure to acknowledge it sounds insulting to the citizens of Czechoslovakia. And they cannot calmly listen to arguments over whether an "invasion" took place 21 August or whether it was merely a case of "sending in troops." Such definitions are of little interest to a people whose home was entered by foreign troops. They did not offer resistance? Agreed, because they displayed wisdom and did not want bloodshed or war. "No one fired on anyone..." Unfortunately, this is not so either. They did open fire. And they crushed [people] with tanks. Czechs and Slovaks long ago compiled a precise score of all the casualties.

I am writing this report 25 June, the day when plenipotentiaries of the Soviet and Czechoslovak Governments signed in Prague the protocol on the completion of the withdrawal of Soviet Army troops and, consequently, also of their 23-year, albeit "temporary" but undoubtedly protracted stay on Czechoslovak soil. The end of a difficult past has been marked. This event has been a cause for joy and rejoicing here. It has been a people's festival, and a gun salute took place. Proposals are being made to celebrate the last day of June as the CSFR's national day of remembrance in the future. V. Havel and A. Dubcek took their leave of Colonel General E.A. Vorobyev, former commander of the Central Group of Forces.

It is a great pity that in this festive, ceremonial atmosphere Federal Assembly Chairman A. Dubcek, in addition to expressing a sense of satisfaction with the efficient work on the troop withdrawal, also had to voice resolute disagreement with the assessments of the crushing of the "Prague Spring" by military means that were made in the interview in question. It is a pity—but could he really have acted differently?

Dubcek's reply to Yazov's interview has been published in the Czechoslovak press. LIDOVE NOVINY reports that an open letter has been sent to the marshal by the CSFR Government commission to analyze the events of 1967-1970.

Let us leave aside the fact that to this day the 1968 intervention burns the hearts of not only Czechoslovak but also Soviet citizens. This is a shared heavy wound

inflicted on us all during those "different times," in a "different situation," in the light of "different problems." As far as I understand it, this too is the official position today of the Soviet Government, parliament, and the president of the USSR.

Maybe LIDOVE NOVINY's correspondent did not give a very accurate account of Yazov's words, or maybe the translation (for I have cited them in reverse translation) has let me down? In that case I apologize most sincerely. But the gist of the assessments remains...

TV Reports Troop Withdrawal Completed

PM0307084991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2057 GMT 30 Jun 91

[From the "Television News Service" newscast: Report by Aleksandr Goryachev, identified by caption]

[Text] [Goryachev] The Soviet troop withdrawal from Czechoslovakia and Hungary was completed today. A tremendous saga. On 27 May 1957 Foreign Minister Gromyko and his Hungarian counterpart Imre Horvath signed an agreement between the USSR and Hungarian Governments on the legal status of Soviet troops on Hungarian territory. And 16 October 1968 a similar agreement was signed by Kosygin, chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Cernik, premier of the CSSR Government. Let us recall that these treaties were concluded within the framework of the Warsaw Pact Organization, but Soviet troops did not always do their immediate job. You only have to recall the well-known events in Hungary and the suppression of the Czechoslovak uprising.

Today computers linked to the TASS system saw on their screens eight [as heard] terse sentences: The USSR Defense Ministry announces that the total withdrawal of Soviet troops from the CSFR and Hungary was completed 30 June. It was carried out on the basis of an intergovernmental agreement.

It is now the experts' turn. They are to resolve the problems of property and funding like those that arose during our Army's withdrawal from Poland. Bielecki's government presented us with a bill for $4.5 billion for environmental damage and is pressing for urgent talks with Moscow. [Item ends approximately 10 minutes and 41 seconds into the broadcast]

East Europe Urged To Uphold Basic Rights

OW0207111491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Monday, the USSR Supreme Soviet approved a draft appeal to parliaments in Central and Eastern Europe, suggested by Leonid Sharin, head of the parliamentary Committee on Defense and National Security. The document states, in part, that leaderships and certain political groups in Central and Eastern Europe have been mounting a campaign of persecution against their compatriots, including ex-leaders, party functionaries, security officers and some creative intellectuals. Soviet MPs believe persecuting people for their political views or party affiliation is at odds with the norms of civilized society.

The USSR Supreme Soviet urges the East European parliaments and Germany's Bundestag to effectively curb "the flagrant violation of universally recognized democratic principles and the basic rights and freedoms of the individual."

Ovchinnikov on East Europe Withdrawal Issues

LD0107160691 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] The Soviet Defense Ministry reports that on 30 June the Soviet troops' withdrawal from Czechoslovakia and Hungary was completed in keeping with intergovernmental agreements. Colonel General Aleksandr Ovchinnikov has given Radio Moscow the following details:

We have withdrawn more than 10 divisions and brigades—over 120,000 personnel in all, along with thousands of family members. Also half a month before the deadline we transferred to the Soviet Union thousands of items of military equipment and other property. The whole operation was well organized and we thank the people of Czechoslovakia and Hungary for their help and consideration.

General Ovchinnikov added, however, that some matters have yet to be settled, the most important being the Soviet property left behind. Consequently Hungary and the Soviet Union have not yet signed a final document on troop withdrawal. He urged all the agencies concerned to step up efforts to settle matters to mutual advantage and added that the Soviet Union hopes the negotiations wouldn't strain relations with either Czechoslovakia or Hungary.

About troop withdrawals from Poland and eastern Germany, General Ovchinnikov said: Up to now the withdrawal from Germany has gone according to plan, though we feel disappointed that the German side isn't fulfilling its obligations. Germany was to have built some housing for the Soviet military men returning home but a year has passed in fruitless negotiations, through the decision was taken at government level. So the Soviet military command in Germany has been forced to warn the federal government that if the situation isn't rectified the withdrawal will have to be slowed down.

General Ovchinnikov mentioned another reason for concern: The Warsaw Treaty Organization no longer exists but NATO does, and there has been no move to dissolve it. This naturally worries our military and political leaders, since arms reduction in Europe cannot be a one-way movement.

Supreme Soviet

'Text' of Statement on Former Bloc Leaders

LD0207122191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1130 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jul (TASS)—Here follows the text of a statement adopted on Monday by the USSR Supreme Soviet:

"Events taking place in Europe mark a qualitatively new stage in the history of its development.

The heads of states and governments of European countries, the United States, and Canada who gathered in the French capital at the end of last year established that the era of confrontation on the continent has ended. They noted the beginning of a new era of peace in Europe and pledged to strengthen democracy and observe human rights and basic freedoms.

Despite these solemn obligations, however, the leadership and certain political circles of a number of countries in central and Eastern Europe are stirring up a campaign of persecution with regard to the former leaders of these states, party functionaries, employees of the law-enforcement bodies, and intellectuals of the arts and sciences. In certain cases this involves criminal prosecution of persons behind which one can quite easily perceive political aims and feelings of vengeance.

Stressing their adherence to the fundamental accords reached within the framework of the all-European process, deputies of USSR Supreme Soviet believe, at the same time, that the desire by certain political circles to step up the persecution of their own citizens for different political views or for membership of a party runs counter to the norms of life in a civilized society. The blatant hounding of people merely because in the recent past they carried out their constitutional duty and obligations as allies is a direct infringement of the rights of the individual.

A human being, whose well-being and happiness are an intransient value, should not become hostage to anyone's political ambitions or a victim of monetary errors or emotions concerning money.

While respecting the right of every state to live according to its own laws, Soviet parliamentarians nonetheless call for compliance with all international agreements by all the states which sign them, without exception. The USSR Supreme Soviet appeals to the parliaments of East European countries and to the German Bundestag to take effective measures to cease the blatant flouting of generally recognized principles of democracy, basic human rights, and freedoms.

Guidelines for Penal Code Adopted

LD0207125491 Moscow TASS in English 1157 GMT 2 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS— In a 321-5 vote with four abstentions, the Soviet parliament today passed legal guidelines, that formulate basic responsibility and punishment terms and give Soviet republics more leeway in drafting their own criminal codes.

The bill takes into account criminal trends in the Soviet Union in the past and the international experience in combating crime.

The document aims to protect an individual from criminal encroachments, protect human rights and freedoms, property, environment, public and state interests and promote law and order, Academician Vladimir Kudryavtsev, speaking on behalf of the parliamentary committee on law-making and law and order, told the parliament.

No person can be found guilty of a crime and persecuted except by a court's ruling and in line with the law, the document stresses. "

Prison terms are basically limited to 10 years, with the maximum term being 15.

The death penalty by firing squad can be applied for state treason, aggravated murder, raping a minor and crimes against peace and humanity.

The death penalty cannot be applied to persons under 18 or women.

Union Treaty's 'Lack of Clarity' Debated

PM0207120391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by G. Shipitko: "Union Treaty; Latest Attempt To Reach Agreement"]

[Text] The interval between the sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet was used by the deputies for work in the committees and commissions. There was the working out of new draft laws which must be discussed and adopted in the time remaining before the parliament vacation. But perhaps the most important thing was discussed at a joint sitting of the Committee on Agrarian and Food Policy and the Commission on nationalities policy and interethnic relations—the draft treaty on the union of sovereign states. This was the completed version of the treaty taking into account the remarks voiced by deputies at the 21-23 May Supreme Soviet session.

The preparatory committee had taken a lot into consideration in the draft. Even in the actual title of the treaty the definition "states" appeared instead of the word "republics." But the polemics which developed in the first minutes of the sitting were not so much about the

articles as about the concept of the Novo-Ogarevo "Nine plus One" agreement and showed that the contradictions have not been eliminated and positions have become even tougher. On the one hand there is a protocol on the intentions of the republics' representatives on the conclusion of this treaty, on the other suspicions still remained that behind the deputies' backs an attempt was being made to resolve the fate of the country. But the problem is not restricted to that alone—essentially there was talk of what kind of union is being created on the basis of the treaty and how far it reflects different ideas about its political content.

To sum up the thrust of the deputies' speeches, they came down to the following: Will the Union be called a socialist power or are we creating something different? How to relate the results of the nationwide referendum, which determined the people's socialist choice, with the concept of the draft treaty, which in no way presupposes the creation of a new ideological state?

For all the seemingly clear answers to these questions the problem is far more serious than it might appear at first glance. Above all the Novo-Ogarevo option for emerging from the political and economic impasse in which our country has found itself presupposes a confederative union of sovereign states. And that, as the deputies noted, does not create the prerequisites for creating a single economic space. The consequences of this decision could affect the future of the entire Union and the lack of clarity of the functions of existing central organs.

Actually, its opponents found many arguments to support the idea that embryonic market relations will become the strengthening factor which will make it possible to overcome national sovereignties and the war of laws. Here there was implied the vital need of each subject of the future Union for the normalization of economic relations. Not a single state can exist without them.

In the deputies' mutually exclusive positions on political organization [obustroystvo] the viewpoint of the Baltic deputies is of undoubted interest. They openly expressed themselves in favor of such a treaty although, as is well known, they did not intend and to all appearances so far do not intend to take part in its elaboration, still less in the procedure of its signing. The thrust of this quite promising approach which, of course, still has to be approved by the republics' parliaments, lies in the same vital need to preserve and support mutually advantageous economic relations.

The critical attitude toward the treaty was not restricted to this alone. State law experts invited to the sitting drew attention primarily to the fact that if the treaty is signed a number of legal absurdities may arise. They include the lack of legal definition of republics which do not sign the treaty. The norms of the former 1922 Union treaty do not extend to them.

It is perfectly obvious that the draft Union treaty sent to the parliaments of nine republics will during its discussion and approval be subjected to substantial changes. Not to mention the fact that it may be rejected by the parliaments of at least two republics. We still have to receive consent to the signing procedure from the USSR Supreme Soviet. Agreement has also been reached with the republics to the participation of representatives of the legislative organ in the signing of the treaty.

In general, it would be overly optimistic to speak today of the new Union treaty as a fait accompli. The only thing that inspires hope is the real understanding by the majority of deputies of the need for the speediest conclusion of this treaty. It was this which was manifested during the deputies' vote at the joint sitting of the committee and commission, approving the draft as a whole. Here the opinion was voiced that it is essential to consider all the remarks voiced.

This outcome to the stormy debates could be regarded as rather unexpected but I believe the point lies elsewhere. Today it is becoming obvious to many people that the future treaty can not immediately resolve all the problems existing in our society. It may rather be categorized as a transitional treaty which gives at least some legal basis for political and economic reforms in society.

This actually was also confirmed during the discussion of the report of specialists and scientists on state building. It concerned constitutional activity and an analysis of the legislative acts of a number of republics. The problem still comes down to the question which torments everyone—what kind of state we are building. And here in their opinion a quite clear tendency has emerged—the republics' legislative activity has virtually no point of contact either with the existing state structure or with the structure planned in the draft Union Treaty. The structure it proposes for the future constitutions of the republics is based primarily on existing world practice and the "nine plus one" draft treaty. It is these which should form the basis of the future Union Constitution.

Privatization Law Debate Reviewed

PM0207135191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "Marathon Called 'Privatization'"]

[Text] One of the most long-suffering draft laws in the two-year history of the new union parliament has undoubtedly been the draft on the basic principles of the destatization and privatization of enterprises. It took six months to ripen deep inside the USSR Supreme Soviet and was then discussed four times at plenary sittings of the session but right up to 28 June it had quite failed to emerge from the vicious circle of amendments and polishing up. And now there has finally been a breakthrough: The document has been adopted as a whole. The deputies embarked on the article by article discussion of the draft.

But the start of the latest round of parliamentary debates at the 28 June morning session in no way presaged this advance. At the start of the debate the opponents of this draft law again seized the initiative.

A. Lukyanov tried to persuade the deputies that this legal act would not alter the nature of society and would retain the diversity of forms of ownership. The main thing, in the opinion of the chair, which the draft law contains is people's interest in the management of property.

Here it should be noted that the opponents of destatization and privatization without, obviously, counting on success in debate, resorted to special arguments. Thus Deputy E. Grinovskis stated at the sitting that he had been warned that if he votes for this document it will do him no good. The chair confirmed that he had had a similar anonymous threat.

The supporters of the adoption of the draft law had the opposite weapon: the force of facts and analysis. They said that the process of destatization in a a number of republics is in full swing and must be put on a legal basis. For instance, Deputy A. Reshetnikov cited the following facts: Since the beginning of this year 126 concerns, 54 combines [obedineniya], and about 1,500 associations [assotsiatsii] have been created in the country and have assumed the right to dispose promptly not only of state property but also of the results of labor. Half of state property has already been handed over to operational management by the "barbarian method" with fabulous tax and other privileges.

During the debate anxiety was heard that unless this process is halted there will be soon nothing left to put under state control: Everything will have been lost down to the last kopek. It was also suggested that certain forces in parliament are interested in thwarting the adoption of the law on the eve of President Gorbachev's London meeting with the heads of the world's seven developed countries.

Ultimately reason and realism prevailed. The union parliamentarians adopted the draft law as a whole except for three articles.

From the outset of the evening sitting there were very grave doubts that the country's parliament would succeed 28 June in adopting the law on destatization and privatization. The results of registration showed that after the lunch break only 336 people's deputies were taking part in the work of the session. But in the hope that the absent participants would arrive later A. Lukyanov, who was in the chair, suggested continuing the debates. The debate over the third article of the draft law, which refers to the principles of destatization and privatization, lasted 45 minutes. The main subject of dispute was again the question of what predominantly the form of the transfer of state property should be—free or, as the draft law proposes, for money. But the contradictions were not resolved through voting.

Counter to the chair's expectations after a repeat registration had been announced the electronic board impassively showed that there were even fewer deputies left in the session hall than at the first registration. All that was left was to continue the debates in order, having collected and analyzed all the remarks which had common in, to embark at the next session if, of course, there is a quorum at it, on the article by article vote without debates.

However that may be, a further three articles of the draft law were gotten through quite quickly. Disputes erupted with their former strength around the question of who the USSR state property fund should be subordinate to—the USSR Cabinet of Ministers or the Union parliament? In A. Lukyanov's opinion the Supreme Soviet has recently adopted too many commitments which are within the competence of executive power and it would be logical to subordinate the state property fund to the government.

The government in the shape of First Deputy Premier V. Doguzhiyev, who was representing it, was in solidarity with the chair's position. V. Doguzhiyev stated on the subject that if the state property fund is withdrawn from the subordination of the Cabinet of Ministers the government rejects responsibility for the course of economic reform.

But a number of deputies—V. Yudin, V. Tatarchuk, and others—pointed to the undesirability of this situation since in their opinion in this case the state property fund would simply become the executor of the will of the Cabinet of Ministers.

And this contradiction, like many others which arose during the debates (the deputies managed to discuss nine articles of the draft law) can only be resolved by voting, and voting will take place when there is a quorum in the country's supreme legislative organ, possibly at the next joint sitting, scheduled for 1 July.

USSR Supreme Soviet 2 July Session

LD0207224191

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1842 GMT on 1 July carries the "At the USSR Supreme Soviet" program on proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow on 2 July.

The sitting is chaired by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov. Deputies continued the discussion today on the fundamentals of criminal legislation of the USSR and republics. There were disagreements on some of the articles during an article-by-article discussion.

At 1844 GMT the discussion begins with Article 26, which deals with the right of every citizen to self-defense. Deputy Yakovlev proposes amendments to the wording

of the article, stressing that everyone has a right to self-defense, and that there should be limitations on exceeding this right.

Deputy Kudryavtsev agrees with Yakovlev's proposal on behalf of the commission for drafting the criminal legislation. Deputy Burlatskiy introduces his changes in the wording of the article. Deputy Ignatovich disagrees with Burlatskiy's proposals, and Deputy Engver supports Ignatovich. Deputy Falin submits his proposals regarding the layout of the article.

At 1854 GMT Deputy Martirosyan asks a specific question on what article will be applied if he uses self-defense in the event of an attack. Burlatskiy insists on an answer to his proposals, but Kudryavtsev says they are unacceptable. Kudryavtsev answers Martirosyan's question and agrees to Falin's proposal.

Deputy Burlatskiy insists on his point of view and quotes cases of rape and sexual attacks. A few deputies present their proposals. A deputy asks how self-defense and the protection of one's property are defined.

At 1902 GMT Lukyanov reads out the article: Every person has a right to self-defense; actions performed in the conditions of necessary self-defense are not classified as criminal if limitations of the necessary self-defense were not exceeded. He puts it to the vote. It is adopted by 285 votes in favor with 22 votes against.

The deputies then engage in a heated discussion on Article 40, which concerns the use of the death penalty. Deputy Ignatovich proposes preserving the death penalty for the rape of minors in aggravated circumstances. Deputy Tyurina proposes to extend the list of crimes punishable by death.

At 1912 GMT Deputy Kirilov proposes withdrawing the death penalty for state treason. Deputy (Konarovskaya) proposes the death penalty for actions aimed at instigating and organizing interethnic strife. Several deputies agree with the proposals of Ignatovich and Tyurina. A female deputy raises a question of punishment by death in the cases of raping women and minors.

Deputy Kudryavtsev says that the commission is opposed to extending the list of crimes punishable by death. The proposal of Ignatovich is put to the vote. The article is adopted with 316 votes in favor and 13 votes against.

At 1919 GMT Lukyanov sums up the results of the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet on renewing the fundamentals of the criminal legislation of the USSR and republics. He thanks everyone for their contributions. The recorded relay ends.

At 1921 GMT an unidentified correspondent sums up further work in the USSR Supreme Soviet: A decision was adopted on setting forth the regulations for the procedure and the conditions for the experimental application of new forms of correction and social rehabilitation of those sentenced and also concerning the improvement in the running of corrective-labor establishments. The deputies also adopted a law on criminal and administrative responsibility for violating the legislation on the protection and use of historical and cultural monuments. The evening sitting of the USSR legislature ratified a number of international agreements, agreed to the appointment of Anisimov as USSR minister of material resources, and started the first reading of the drafts of a law on industrial designs and a law on USSR trademarks and service marks. Tomorrow the deputies will continue to discuss them at a joint sitting of the chambers.

Political & Social

Democratic Reform Movement Holds News Conference

LD0207230791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2020 GMT 2 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jul (TASS)—The news conference of the political figures who came out with the initiative for the creation of the "Movement for Democratic Reform" held today at the Moscow Soviet was devoted to the tasks and directions of the activity of the movement. Taking part in the news conference were Eduard Shevardnadze, former USSR minister of foreign affairs; Gavriil Popov and Anatoliy Sobchak, the mayors of Moscow and Leningrad; Arkadiy Volskiy, president of the Scientific-Industrial Union, former head of department of the CPSU Central Committee; and Nikolay Petrakov, radical economist.

Replying to correspondents questions, the participants in the news conference noted that so far it was planned to set up only the organizational committee of the movement which, in their view, should be of an all-Union nature, and also subdivisions of the organizational committee in the localities. As Eduard Shevardnadze noted, the "movement" faces two main tasks—to save democracy, ensure the continuation of the radical reforms in the field of politics and economics, and also to "remove the threat of dictatorship and reversion to a totalitarian regime."

At the first stage all parties and organizations that share these common aims are invited to take part in the "movement." Anyone who shares its aims can join the "movement." Participation in it will not imply the need to leave the parties.

At the first stage, in the words of Anatoliy Sobchak, "a certain amorphousness is inevitable." In September of this year it is planned to hold a constituent conference at which the rules and program of the organization will be worked out, and it will be determined whether it will remain a "movement" or be transformed into a party.

Eduard Shevardnadze, Anatoliy Sobchak, and Gavriil Popov, expressing their personal opinion, unambiguously advocated that as a result an all-Union party should be set up.

A special place was occupied by the question of the participation of members of the CPSU in the "movement." "We have come to the conclusion that the 'movement' must not be built on an anti-party basis; its main aim is the consolidation of all forces," Arkadiy Volskiy said. "I consider that all progressive forces should be consolidated in the 'movement'—not depending on their party affiliation, but depending on their attitude to the reforms in the country," he considers. "There are a huge number of rank-and-file members of the Communist Party who have always been assigned the role of people silently approving the decisions being adopted for them by the leaderhship. The rank-and-file members of the CPSU who share the ideals of democracy and progress can and should be seen as possible participants in our 'movement,' and in the event of the establishment of a party, also as possible members of that new party," Anatoliy Sobchak declared.

All those taking part in the news conference noted the special importance of representatives of all the Union republics taking part in the "movement." "The experience of the last two years has shown that the alienation of the democratic forces in the republics has a very negative effect on the resolution of all questions," Anatoliy Sobchak feels.

Answering the question of whether Mikhail Gorbachev had known about preparations for the establishment of the "movement," Arkadiy Volskiy said: "I can tell you firmly: He was informed of this." With regard to the prospects for the possibility of the president of the USSR joining the "movement," according to Nikolay Petrakov, "judging by a number of the latest speeches of Mikhail Gorbachev, our 'movement' is not as yet threatened by his joining."

IZVESTIYA Runs 'Extracts' of Appeal

PM0207200191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

["Extracts" from appeal by Arkadiy Volskiy, Gavriil Popov, Aleksandr Rutskoy, Anatoliy Sobchak, Stanislav Shatalin, Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Ivan Silayev, and Nikolay Petrakov of the "Movement for Democratic Reform"; first paragraph is introduction: "For the Unification of the Forces of Democracy and Reform"]

[Text] A group of well known politicians has made an appeal to the people. IZVESTIYA prints extracts from it.

The country is in crisis. People are ceasing to understand and to listen to one another. Conflicts, bitterness, animosity, and violence are intruding into life.

Society is split and ultraconservative forces are strengthening their positions. This is the main thing that is hindering creative processes and the reaching of concord and objectively sowing destructive tendencies.

Enough bitterness. Enough talk. People are tired. Real actions are needed. Specific action and results from the viewpoint of people's interests must be take priority.

We are convinced that a fundamentally new situation requiring a qualitatively new step in democratic development prevails in the country. We appeal to everyone who cares for our state's fate, who values individual freedom, who sees his future in a democratic, rule-of-law society, and who wants and knows how to work, to all civic-minded and civically responsible people to unite in a **"Movement for Democratic Reform."**

This "movement" will try to really renew society in the interests of the people and of a worthy and secure life for people.

Our movement calls for the return to the people of what has been taken away from them. To the peasant—land. To the worker—unpaid labor and the results of his work, and he must be made the owner of associated plants and factories. To the intelligentsia—the right to its intellectual property. To officers—the proud feeling of being defenders of the motherland. To believers—the church. To the peoples—their culture and traditions and their history and historical memory.

The supreme aim is the **rebirth** first and foremost of man himself and the recognition of his paramount, fundamental importance to society. The rebirth of his morality and his taste for life, creative labor, activeness and quest, and social optimism.

Politically this "movement" is firmly committed to justice [pravo], the law, and constitutional methods of operation. Democracy through legality—there is no other way. The supremacy of justice and the certainty of fundamental human rights and freedoms. [sentence as published]

Regarding **economic** aspirations it professes freedom in the economy, diversity and equality of forms of ownership, consistent destatization and privatization, freedom of enterprise accompanied by effective social protection mechanisms, the demilitarization of society and the economy, parliamentary control over defense expenditure, and the creation of the most favorable and worthy conditions in which man can freely work, earn a living, and live securely.

Spiritually the "movement" for real rebirth is open to all genuine achievements of science and culture, social thought, and mankind's socio-historical experience. Our criteria are the moral, practical, and scientific validity of any theories, concepts, approaches, or decisions. Only society itself, the people and their practical experience can be the arbiter of choice.

The "movement" regards as morally justified and acceptable in practice only a nationalities policy that really fundamentally defends human rights and the equal rights of all communities and peoples to democratic and law-based forms of life.

We proceed from the fact that the collapse of the totalitarian system should not lead to the collapse of naturally developed historical ties between peoples. It is equally obvious that guaranteed national independence and freedom can be obtained only in a free state.

The only sensible alternative to a united USSR can be a democratic state of a voluntary Union of Sovereign Peoples.

That is why we support the Novo-Ogarevo process and the "nine plus one" agreements as an opportunity to save our multinational community and preserve it in the form of a new-style state.

We are for the unity between domestic and foreign policy and openness in that policy.

We are against the growing destruction of the ecosystem and an ecological war against ourselves.

And so, our principles are these:

—man's spiritual, economic, and political freedom; his social and economic protection;

—a parliamentary republic;

—legality and law and order;

—a radical transformation of the economic system, competition and equal opportunity, and the transformation of the country's citizens into the masters of property and the results of their labor;

—national cooperation, the preservation of our state's historical nucleus as a union of free and sovereign peoples;

—condemnation and rejection of any forms of national extremism, chauvinism, racism, or anti-Semitism;

—common sense, constructive cooperation between all responsible citizens and enemies of chaos and anarchy;

—equal and committed cooperation in foreign policy and foreign economic affairs, civilization's peaceful development.

We call for the formation in the very near future of an organizing committee to prepare for a constituent conference by mid-September 1991 to unite democratic movements and parties in the republics and regions. As regards the movement's organizational form—the formation of a party for example—that must be decided by the constituent conference.

[Signed] Arkadiy Volskiy, Gavriil Popov, Aleksandr Rutskoy, Anatoliy Sobchak, Stanislav Shatalin, Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Ivan Silayev, Nikolay Petrakov.

TASS Reports on Movement

LD0207115191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1003 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] [no dateline as received] The appeal adopted last Saturday by the "Movement for Democratic Reform" organizing committee states that the country is facing a choice: either to go "further along the path of cardinal change," or to have "a revolt by reaction, blinded by hatred for freedom and progress" and an inevitable "nationwide tragedy."

Society is split and ultra-conservative forces are digging in, the document's authors believe. The struggle by reactionary forces against the emerging democracy is being made easier by the fact that "the democratic forces are disunited and frequently lapse into fighting among themselves."

Members of the organizing committee of the "Movement for Democratic Reform" believe that a fundamentally new situation is emerging in the country which requires a qualitatively new step in democratic development. "Only the immediate consolidation of the more aware, constructive, and responsible sections of society" can save the country.

The initiators of the "Movement" appeal to peasants, workers, the intelligentsia and believers, and to all "classes, groups and strata of our society."

The "Movement" expresses adherence to the "supremacy of law and to the indispensibility of fundamental human rights and freedoms." It favors "the search for compromise, for accord, and for joint actions." "The country will not survive a second civil war."

The movement "believes in freedom of the economoy, diversity, and equality of forms of ownership, and freedom of enterprise."

The "Movement" proceeds from the premise that "the collapse of the totalitarian system must not lead to the collapse of the ties built up naturally between peoples through the course of history." The sole sensible alternative to a unitary USSR could only be a democratic state resulting from a voluntary union of sovereign peoples.

The "Movement" calls upon "all who have left the CPSU," nonparty people and members of the national-democratic movements and parties to join it. It asserts that it is "in no way claiming to replace the existing parties and movements which are already playing an historic role in combating totalitarianism." The initiators of the "Movement" are suggesting that those "who cherish the idea of uniting" join the new movement. It proposes to others, "on the basis of the principle of their

full political and organizational sovereignty, cooperation and interaction." "We have no dealings only with those people who are planning to go back to the methods of totalitarianism," the document says.

NPS Supports Movement

OW0307054191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Chairman of the executive committee of the Scientific Industrial Union of the USSR (NPS), Mr. Aleksandr Vladislavlev said that the union did not intend to joint the Movement for Democratic Reform as a collective member if only because as far as he knew the movement did not offer this form of membership.

As is already known, Mr. Arkadiy Volskiy, the president of the NPS, is one of the nine signatories of the document calling for the creation of such a movement. The NPC itself unites the heads of enterprises responsible for 65 percent of the Soviet Union's production.

Mr. Vladislavlev emphasised that the activity of the NPS and the activity of the new movement are quite different things.

Once again he rejected the claim that the NPS is some kind of party of industrialists. As soon as the NPS changes into a party, continued Mr. Vladislavlev, it will be unable to meet one of its main principles—to consolidate all participants in material production without regard for the form of ownership in order to protect the economy from ideology and to give it the opportunity to develop in correspondence with its logic and laws.

Nevertheless, said Mr. Vladislavlev, the NPS supports all democratic forces, including the Movement for Democratic Reforms now being set up.

Sobchak, Popov Remark on Movement

LD0207213391

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian at 1600 GMT on 2 July broadcasts a five-minute report by correspondent Akeksandr Ruvinskiy on a news conference by the Movement for Democratic Reform. After quoting from their statement he says that a "question was raised about the relations of the democratic movements in the republics, including the Baltics, with the newly created movement. Here is what Anatoliy Sobchak and Gavriil Popov had to say."

Recorded excerpts of Sobchak's and Popov's remarks follow. Sobchak says: ' One of the main ideas at the basis of our initiative is precisely the idea of uniting the general democratic movement with all democratic movements and national movements existing in the republics, in order to create a broad field to unite all democratic forces. We consider that even in those republics which (?I will name)—for example, the Baltics, Georgia, Moldova—which have declared that they do not want to sign the Union treaty, the current version of the Union treaty—that in these republics, too, it is essential to unite all democratic forces in order to fight together for democratic ideals, so that the political process of the transformation of our society and the economic processes of the transformation of our country may be implemented and seen through to the end. The experience of the last two years has shown that this kind of division and scattering of democratic forces in the republics is having a very negative effect on the solution of all questions."

Popov says: "There have been certain talks with a number of democratic parties and movements in the Union republics; among others there have been contacts between Nikolay Ilyich Travkin and the Democratic Party of Tajikistan and the Democratic Party of Turkmenia. These contacts have shown that in the Union republics, including those not taking part in the Novo-Ogarevo process, there is a sufficiently powerful and clearly expressed aspiration to unite the efforts of the democratic forces on a common scale."

CPSU 'Schism' Concerns PRAVDA Readers

PM0307092391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by T. Samolis under "Reflections on Letters" rubric: "The Party: Era of Schism?"]

[Text] On my work desk is PRAVDA's mailbag on the party. Reading it is no easy or pleasant task: Most of the letters contain alarm and pain over the fate of the CPSU, over our common fate.

"It is absolutely clear that 16 million Communists cannot be a monolith," V. Stepanov writes from Moscow. "The dividing line in the CPSU, as in the rest of society, runs between the supporters and the opponents of reform. A parting of the ways has become imminent, the era of schism is upon us. I think that if a congress were to be convened now, the delegates would enter by the same door, but leave by different doors..."

There are many such letters, especially now, when the new Party Program has been drafted. And no one can be indifferent about where Communists will go, or with whom, or what awaits them tomorrow.

The fact that the crisis has come to a head became clear from the dramatic events at the joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission back in late April. At the time, you will recall, some local leadership representatives developed a burning desire to remove M.S. Gorbachev from the post of general secretary. Party comrades behaved themselves in a far from comradely manner. And this is extremely symptomatic of relations within the CPSU today. At times, two Communists, on meeting, begin talking as if

in different languages, not understanding, indeed, not wanting to understand one another. Even blatant antipathy and barefaced threats are no rarity: You will be sorry, they say, when our time comes. Whereas earlier these threats were uttered mostly by extremists of a left-wing bent and by some nonparty figures, now the members of the once-united CPSU themselves are ready to slug it out. Perhaps a schism is indeed looming?

But in that case let us reflect: Where does it come from, this threat to unity? There is, I think, no unequivocal answer here; the causes are complex, but one of them (which the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission Plenum highlighted) derives from the Russian apparatchiks, who are manifestly thirsting for revenge for their defeat in the early years of perestroyka. They not only want revenge, they are even active at local levels—sometimes crudely and clumsily, but active all the same—fomenting discontent from below and in effect inciting people toward schism.

Nevertheless, I see the main danger in something else. There is no need to look for it elsewhere, it is within the party of the Communists itself, which has so lagged behind the processes taking place in society, and, alas, continues to do so. The paradox is: The party began perestroyka and renewal, but it is the party itself which, to this day, has not succeeded in renewing itself, or has simply been incapable of renewing itself... Moreover, it would appear that the leadership is not drawing the appropriate inferences from the lessons which life has afforded, but, seemingly deliberately, is repeating the mistakes of both left- and right-wing forces, thereby demonstrating its inability to find its bearings quickly and coherently in contemporary social processes.

After the abolition of the infamous Article 6, the party somehow wilted and took on the role of... a whipping boy. And indeed it is being whipped—unsparingly. Some renewal this is!

People see all this and understand it. I judge this from their letters.

"The 28th CPSU Congress condemned the allegedly antiparty actions of 'Democratic Platform.' The majority of its members have left the CPSU. But with the appearance of the Russian Communist Party, the schism intensified. Their paper is also turning from an organ of the CPSU Central Committee into a mouthpiece for schism. Responsible figures propagandizinging thoughts opposed to the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress have appeared on its pages many times. The Russian Communist Party leadership—Zyuganov, Melnikov, Belov—speak against CPSU decisions. In many of the republic communist parties a split has in effect taken place already. In Georgia the Communist Party is virtually outlawed. I think that the issue of intraparty debate on the question of a parting of the ways must be solved at the next CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The reformist wing of the party under M.S. Gorbachev's leadership must resolve on this step. We are the majority. And let the breakaway section of Communists who won't waive their principles organize their own party." (V. Artemasov, CPSU member, Leningrad).

"I support Comrade Sergeyev's call for the convocation of an extraordinary (emergency) CPSU congress. I feel that in recent times life has compelled us to look more critically at the actions of M.S Gorbachev's team and to distance ourselves from it." (Ye. Lukyanenko, CPSU member, Kiev).

"What do you think, how much longer will SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA continue to lash A.N. Yakovlev? A course aimed at causing a split has clearly been set, but via driving out of the party all those who support Gorbachev's reforms. The party must not be sold off to the leaders of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party." (V. Shvedov, CPSU member, Moscow.)

What a lot of different people we are, it turns out, who have gathered (or remained?) under the same party roof! It would actually be a good thing that we are different, if it were not to such an extent that we are becoming almost enemies. Perhaps it would indeed be better to part? That would be more fitting and honorable than to foul our own nest and to endlessly suspect each other of betraying the interests of the party and the people.

But we are not just different, we have grievances too. It is these grievances which are hindering the renewal of the CPSU. Some consider themselves true Marxists, others true democrats. All this is, in my view, utter rubbish. The country is going through an extremely severe crisis, blood is being spilled in peacetime, and Communists are playing a game of "true" Marxists or "genuine" democrats, although all truth should be first and foremost with the people.

A party that is renewing itself simply can not allow itself to live as if in airless space if it really wishes to renew itself. Life has presented the CPSU with a mass of problems, and not just political problems, but social and psychological problems too. No amount of good intentions will help us if we do not feel the pulse of life, if we isolate ourselves in our cells and start calculating who is "truer."

We must clearly give an answer to the question as to whose interests the party represents today. Whom does it defend and on whose trust does it primarily rely?

If it wants to remain an influential force, readers stress, the party does not have the right to evade battle. It is fighting internally, although externally there are battles going on in the streets—on such beachheads as civil concord, the unity of the Union, and economic revival.

Today, while it is not too late, the party is duty-bound to think about the consequences of the "nine plus one" agreement. What might these consequences consist of? It has been clearly stated: After the new constitution is adopted there will be presidential elections. Will the

CPSU put forward its own candidate or not? People are waiting, waiting very expectantly for an answer to this far from straightforward question.

Unfortunately, much of what our readers write in their concern for the fate of the party is indicative not of a perestroyka within it, but a belated adjustment to circumstances. "Let us wait and see"—this kind of logic is unacceptable today. A party that bides its time has, I think, no hope of success. Moreover, it is obvious that the main trials for the CPSU are still ahead. But it is also clear that the fate of the party is in its own hands. It should not let it slip from its grasp...

Shevardnadze Comments on CPSU Investigation

PM0307101191 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 25, 23 Jun 91 p 6

[Interview with Eduard Shevardnadze by unidentified correspondent; no place or date of interview given; first five paragraphs are introduction: "A Catastrophe Which the Bolsheviks Will be Unable to Survive"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Control Commission is vigilant. Any steps to the right or to the left of the party's general line are, as always, seen as attempted flight, and the paper bullets of its resolutions are, as always, fired without warning. No sooner had Eduard Shevardnadze spoken in Vienna of the expediency of creating a democratic party in the USSR which would operate "in parallel with the CPSU," and a shot was fired—a party investigation is to be held. Another shot followed—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, a newspaper which willingly promotes all the pompous trivialities emanating from Staraya Ploshchad [CPSU Central Committee headquarters]—published an article exposing Shevardnadze ("On the Pendulum of the 'New Thinking'", 15 June).

An ideological base is being urgently put together to underpin the Central Control Commission's decision, which cannot be perceived as anything else but struggle against divergent thinking and dissidence within the party. And even though the article does not mention Shevardnadze's statement, its entire meaning nonetheless boils down to the same old formula: The former USSR foreign minister has been harming the Russian Empire for a long time now, and the time has finally come to settle accounts with him.

Two Communists charge Shevardnadze: "The catastrophe which has befallen the USSR in international relations is equal to the consequences of defeat in... World War III which has not been fought." Moreover, the authors—of course—do not explain why Shevardnadze is to blame for this "catastrophe" while the Nobel Peace Prize for it was awarded to their party's General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev.

So, what does this "catastrophe" involve? This is the conclusion prompted by the article's logic: The actual "mechanism of violence" of which the bolsheviks have spoken so many impassioned words has collapsed—a catastrophe. Man is no longer a cog within this mechanism and is respected all over the world—a catastrophe. Gaps have appeared in the prison fence known for some reason as state border—a catastrophe. This really is a catastrophe. For those who dream of revenge for the demolition of totalitarianism. And they are prepared to shoot without warning. Using not just the bullets of resolution. Shooting not just at Shevardnadze.

A MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI correspondent asked Eduard Shevardnadze a few questions.

MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI: This is neither the first nor the second attempt in our country to discredit Shevardnadze as politician and as individual. Now, following the CPSU Central Control Commission decision, we can talk about a concerted offensive—a kind of "last and decisive battle." What lies behind all this?

Eduard Shevardnadze: I find it very difficult to explain what is happening. Previously, I perceived the fact that man has been freed and has finally gained the right to freedom of speech, of conscience, and of thinking as the most important gain in the last few years. And this is the main—or rather the only—thing we have given people who lead a very tough and difficult life. But events in the past few days testify to the contrary. This concerns more than just me personally or my personal grievances. This is dangerous for society. Someone ponders the future of democracy and the building of a rule-of-law state, voices his opinions... and an investigation is launched. Think of how much was said to the effect that democratization must begin with the party, that the party itself must set an example. What sort of example is it setting? The very term "investigation" is reminiscent of the thirties—our darkest age. Forces that are in the party's higher echelons want to bring back those years. This is what worries me, this is what alarms me.

MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI: Your speech at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies when you announced your resignation, and your book which is soon to be published, are both couched in tones of great loyalty to Mikhail Gorbachev. Moreover, you emphasized that he remains your friend. But during a recent television interview you were forced to agree: The Central Control Commission's decision could not have been made without the general secretary's knowledge.

Eduard Shevardnadze: Yes, I confirm this now as well. But I would not like to inflame any passions around this issue because it concerns me personally. What I put in the forefront are not my relations with, say, the general secretary or the country's president, but the problems which perturb me. This is primarily the creation of a serious and constructive opposition. Do you have any guarantees that a coup will not occur tomorrow?

MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI: No.

Eduard Shevardnadze: We must acquire political guarantees through the creation of a party, through the rallying of democratic forces. This is in the interests of

all sober minded people including the president, if he is committed to democracy and if he does want to build a rule-of-law state. It is by no means mandatory for everyone to join this party. Nobody hinders the existence of Communists. But another powerful party must operate in parallel with them. This is the main point today.

MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI: You yourself have repeatedly emphasized that we are running out of time. So has the time come to move on from reflections to actions?

Eduard Shevardnadze: It is my nature to reflect a long time and then to make decisions quickly.

MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI: Let us get back to the attacks against you. Ultimately, this concerns not only the person of the former foreign minister but the Soviet Union's entire foreign policy which is founded, as we already said, on the new thinking.

Eduard Shevardnadze: Do you mean that the president must defend the foundations of foreign policy? You are right. He should not keep silent. It is necessary to defend the tremendous results that have already been achieved. Multitudes of people gathered during my recent trip to the United States. There were audiences of between 5,000 and 10,000 people. They constantly asked one main question: Tell us, how can we help, how can we support democracy and the progressive processes in the Soviet Union? That which until recently was being done at government level is now widely known among the peoples, among the younger generation. This is our greatest gain. The fact that we will not be waging war on America is no longer just verbiage. People genuinely believe us —we have no intention of waging war. This elementary formula contains great prospects for the Americans and for us alike.

MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI: In your view, what is the ultimate goal of those who are striving to raze our foreign policy to the ground?

Eduard Shevardnadze: To uphold the totalitarian system, to return to a closed society.

MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI: A closed society would be our domestic misfortune. But what lies in store for our neighbors if that were to happen?

Eduard Shevardnadze: I have always said this, and I still say it: This will be a tragedy for our neighbors and for the whole world. If someone accuses us of having lost East Europe, of having lost Germany, this means that these people assume a return there to be possible. How? Fight a war again? Who will be shedding their blood, never mind the basic ideas of humanism? These are terrible people who either do not realize or are unwilling to realize the possible consequences.

MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI: But how does the West react, for example, to laments about East Europe?

Eduard Shevardnadze: People there follow carefully the development of events in our country and analyze these speeches. Especially since they are, more often than not, made by quite high-ranking people and not by rank and filers. Caution is growing. I have witnessed this. Not just in the United States but in many European countries. There is great and justified alarm because everything we have done over the last few years is now being questioned.

Pondering CPSU Membership

OW0307034991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In a comment on the fact that his behavior has come under scrutiny by the Communist Party Central Control Commission, Eduard Shevardnadze said that "one of these days I shall make up my mind whether to remain a member of the Communist Party and make an appropriate statement". He said this at a press confeence in the Moscow City Council on Tuesday, which was held in connection with the signing of the declaration calling to create a "Movement for Democratic Reforms".

Yakovlev on Need for New Party

PM0207165191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2

[Article by Aleksandr Yakovlev: "New Step Needed"]

[Text] Times are hard. And it is time to stop beating around the bush. To make it clearer what I am going to write about, let me say this: I have always advocated a multiparty system, or more accurately, a healthy, democratic two-party system. There is simply no alternative, if we are not to indulge in hypocrisy and try to deceive people into thinking that society is proceeding and intends to proceed along the path of democracy.

There has recently been a great deal of ballyhoo to the effect that someone, somewhere, some time, is planning to split the party. All kinds of statements, sometimes mutually contradictory, are attributed to me, among others. I perceive an unseemly game in all this. The truth lies elsewhere.

For a long time now the united CPSU has not existed, it has not existed since 1985, when social development embarked on the path of creating a fundamentally new system which would be capable of extricating the country from the profound social crisis and ensuring a worthy life for the individual. Today it is no secret that we spent 70 years building a system that is indifferent to the individual, hostile to him. The marriage (of convenience and of love) between monopoly power and monopoly ownership did its work.

In other words, the CPSU is "pregnant with" a multiparty system. It would be logical to recognize this fact and think up a system of measures enabling us to

transform this situation into a civilized multiparty system of the parliamentary type as painlessly as possible, to society's benefit. Something of this kind is indeed happening spontaneously. But instead of a conscious strategy based on profound political analysis, we have a collection of grievances and instinctive physical convulsions in the spirit of the worst examples of the past. Even an attempt simply to mention these things, these phenomena, and to call for them to be discussed, provokes acute hostility and the desire to punish—as happened with E.A. Shevardnadze.

The consequences of this are dangerous to society. The unwillingness or inability to analyze the real situation and the habit of controlling life by means of the deceptive magic of whipping up a new terror are resulting in a social polarization whose outcome is unpredictable.

Therefore we must not be evasive, we must admit honestly that the democratic rebirth of the CPSU, its break with the dictatorial past, and its transformation into an effective political organization have not happened. That the revolution in society has not led to a revolution in the party.

Democracy has proved alien to the party's apparatus structures. We can give it due credit for dogmatic stubbornness, but not for the ability to greet the wind of change in a fitting manner. Experience shows that its organizational structures, political ossification, intolerance, and constant urge to look for "enemies" condemn the party to a steady decline toward confrontation with society, and particularly with its most active and patriotic section.

I can clearly picture the "unblemished" and "infallible" heroes of our time now coming forward, standing firm for... alas, I don't know what. That is for them to say...

What is it all about?

Despite all the decisions, the appeals and solemn vows, the direct and indirect warnings from public opinion, the party apparatus is incapable of heeding the voice of reason and taking a sober look at the life all around it, discarding the fetters of dogma and base longings for power, and reorganizing itself, as life demanded as long ago as 1985.

A whole string of recent plenums, aktivs, publications, and speeches by leading party workers centrally and locally, especially by members of the leadership and apparatus of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee, shows that the party leadership at all levels and the party apparatus are hastily mobilizing party members against democratic transformations, against economic and political freedoms. Instead of being oriented toward real action, including democratic development, they plunge the public into senseless ideological feuding which splits both society and the country. In some places they seek circuitous, unconstitutional, violent ways and means of acting. Ultraconservatism insists on a "battle against the forces of darkness," representing democracy as the source of the main danger to renewal, as if the neo-Stalinists were its mainstay.

The constant complaint is: The old structures have crumbled, there are no new ones. Nonsense! The old structures still stand as they used to stand. It is just that above them there is no longer the brute force that was built into the Stalinist-Brezhnevist system. So there they are—some have simply fallen apart and are idle, some are working exclusively for themselves, some are zealously putting spokes in the wheels of transformations. And so they show what they are really like, these champions of the people's interests, the people's social defenders, with their "socialist consciousness."

Certain Russian Communist Party leaders at all levels are particularly active in their destructiveness. Theoretically they are not in opposition, but in practice that is precisely where they are every single day, because they will not accept the new political course of reshaping society. I am not even going to mention the Leningrad initiative group.

The tragedy of the situation also lies in the fact that when fundamental political decisions are taken, the great mass of Communists are not even consulted. The vast majority of people in the CPSU are honest people and patriots. They have demonstrated this at every stage of our history. But they have been pushed aside by the party's ruling stratum. I personally am opposed to rabid anticommunism, which is just as destructive as Stalinism and neo-Stalinism.

True, there is discord and disintegration in the country—but it is the disintegration of thoroughly rotten structures. We should not save them, we should continue the real transformations. Otherwise they will drag us all to the bottom after them. In other words, transformations in the country have run up against a solid wall of hatred, alienation, ideological hostility, and real resistance from the forces of extreme conservatism and reaction, everything that is self-interested, reactionary, malicious, and idle, everything that wants to hold onto the old order with all its might.

All this is happening, and doubtless will continue. But even as they defend their boundless egotism, these forces display all the signs of being historically doomed. They have failed to offer anything intelligible or coherent as an alternative to the ideals and moral guidelines of renewal. They are capable of doing a good deal of damage, but they are unable to resolve a single one of the real problems the people are experiencing. They have failed to bring forward a leader capable at least of inspiring purely human and political respect, if not agreement with his ideas and approaches. They exploit the people's interests, but it is the people who reject and push away these forces every time they have the opportunity to do so, in every possible way—and not only through the results of votes.

The policy of transformations is at a crossroads. In the worst case, millions of people who put their trust in the possibility of changing life for the better could find themselves abandoned to be torn to pieces by forces whose moral shape is familiar from the past.

That is the most alarming thing. This zigzag of fate would cut off for decades to come all attempts or prospects of free, democratic development. It would mean the whole of society plunging haphazardly into a profound abyss of immorality and fanaticism based on ideology and nationalism.

Not everything, of course, stems from the malice of individual people or leaders. There are serious objective factors. In essence, in my view, the revolution "from above" has spent itself, having done everything or almost everything it could do. Its resources are exhausted. It has achieved much to enable our long-suffering country and all its peoples to begin to build the only worthy human life—a life of freedom, reason, and conscience. What has already been achieved is forever a part of history.

But the continuation of the process—such are the laws of development—requires a constant regrouping of forces, a quest for new opportunities to widen the social, political, and economic base. This is not happening yet.

How can this be explained?

In my view, **one reason** is the obvious fact that in the country, society, and party of the "model of 1985" and even later, nonviolent perestroyka could begin and win the right to exist and develop only as a policy adopted and supported officially and in accordance with established procedure by the CPSU. To separate this course from the party line would have been to condemn the renewal to defeat, and its initiators to moral and political annihilation, and would have ruled out all further attempts at reforms for years and maybe decades.

The **second reason**, which is equally obvious: At the beginning of perestroyka its initiators had no doubt that the CPSU would support the course of renewal and would be able to implement it. Indeed, at the time there were no sufficiently weighty grounds for such doubts. But the actual situation has proved to be much more complex than it had appeared in the mid 1980s. Attitudes toward perestroyka among the leadership stratum of the CPSU are becoming increasingly heterogeneous with the passage of time. Some inherent qualities of the party apparatus are objectively at variance with sentiments of renewal and the reforms themselves.

The **third reason**, which is becoming increasingly clear only now: It is impossible to disregard the possibility that the forces of right-wing extremism and reaction will attempt to dispose of the ideas behind the transformations and their initiators. And the point is not that the implementation of such an attempt is technically and politically possible but that, in my view, it is highly likely. Perestroyka simply does not have a second echelon of forces to counter such a turn of events.

Therefore there is every reason to ask oneself and others: Is everything possible being done today to renew life, curb a selfish and antipeople revolt by reaction, and discredit its true face in the eyes of the people? I think not. Moreover it is obvious that the relative tenacity of conservatism is the result not so much of its own actions as of insufficient organization and coordination on the part of the forces of democracy and renewal.

There is only one way to avoid sliding toward the abyss: by creating and molding an effective parliamentary multiparty system in the country in which the forces of the leading parties can be compared against each other. This is why I am convinced: It is in the interests of society and all its sober-minded members and leaders to participate in this area of democracy and promote it. The benefits are strategic: Democracy as the guarantor of dynamic stability during a period of extremely intensive and complex development for the country. This is why I share and support the idea of creating a movement or party with a democratic orientation based on the law, common sense, the renaissance of man, and unswerving loyalty to the idea of freedom.

I am sure that what I am writing about is not an abstract scheme or an attempt to implant something artificial. All of us—both society as a whole and all its sections and institutions—are facing a watershed whose depth and strength we are only just beginning to comprehend. We are facing the inevitability of a precise political boundary being drawn between those who are in favor of reform and those who are against. Unless we express ourselves resolutely and by action in favor of renewal we will remain in a state of stagnation and doom ourselves to a process of decline in world development. Unless we learn to find nonviolent solutions to our internal affairs we will keep coming back to the repeatedly tried path of totalitarianism, violence, and bondage. The possibility of combining renewal with civilized norms of life is to be found only in democratic development. It alone carries the potential to uplift the country.

Democratic reformation from above must fuse with democratic revolution from below. The revolution of renewal will open up new horizons for itself and for society only if it is linked by multitudinous channels and threads with broad, daily, businesslike support for the reforms on the part of the democratic masses. This reunification process is an imperative.

It is impossible to develop democracy without first making the process of its development truly democratic, stemming from people, collectives, peoples. Economic and political freedom—not in words but in practice, not at the level of the Constitution and laws but in every place where people live and work—cannot be achieved if this process is demanded from somewhere tangential rather than from the depths of the people's life.

The task of democratic development must be perceived and prescribed as a task in its own right—and one of paramount importance. It is fundamentally wrong to rely on individual new phenomena in our life, or even the whole package of such phenomena—glasnost, economic transformations, free elections, and so forth—automatically bringing democracy on their own. There are no rigid causal relationships here, nor can there be.

Democratic development means first and foremost a powerful and effective socioeconomic base. When we call for a mixed economy, equality between all forms of ownership, and the need for demonopolization, removal of state controls, and privatization, we are by no means talking only about considerations of economic efficiency. We are talking primarily about creating the kind of socioeconomic infrastructure that would make things as difficult as possible for antidemocratic and authoritarian ambitions and tendencies. Their total elimination is hardly a possibility. We must not deceive ourselves with maximalist appeals and decisions here.

The democratic development of the country means the existence of a broad and influential social movement in favor, in defense, and in support of democracy. The need for it is urgent. Either the country will advance further along the road of fundamental transformations, the emancipation of society, and real human freedom, or it will retreat into some variant of dictatorship or other, into bondage and violence, into the restoration in one form or another of ways that have proved their destructiveness in the past. We are capable of being pushed into this abyss not only by reaction but also by inertia, hesitancy, and doubts, passivity and idleness, and watching indifferently as the people's expectations are buried.

So that this kind of thing does not happen, the democratic movement must finally overcome its own amorphousness, internecine conflicts, disunity, and protracted period of achievement of self-awareness and self-assertion and assess at their true worth those who are prepared to risk the fate of the people and the country solely to hang on to a past that treated them so well.

By its very nature the democratic movement is a movement of creators, not destroyers. It is a movement from which new, bigger, and closer spiritual and social relationships and communities emerge, rather than one in which old ones blow apart and crumble.

It must incorporate everybody—including CPSU members—whose objective is the real renewal of society in the interests of the people and on the tracks of democracy. Everybody who is able and willing to work for this.

Despite the many natural and inevitable differences they will have between themselves, its participants must be devoted to a common objective—the establishment in the country of democratic foundations of life and a democratic mentality, giving this objective unconditional priority over any differences of view. At least until democracy is firmly on its feet.

In conclusion let me permit myself an analogy. How long it took us to come to acknowledge the need for a transition to the market! The number of experiments, arguments, and debates we had. But even so this transition is still proving difficult.

The task of democratic development is no easier. If anything it is much more difficult since it is much more dependent on people's mentalities, on many traditional and inherited factors that evolve extremely slowly. This task needs to be approached fully armed with honest and scientific analysis. Delay is impossible, impermissible: That would mean dooming ourselves to tribulations for which there can no longer be any justification at this time.

Without democracy there is no worthy future.

I consider it my moral duty to continue to uphold the cause of transformations and to seek and utilize all worthy forms of struggle against reaction and for democracy.

Soyuz Leader Sees Constitution as Paramount

PM0207101591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview with A. Chekhoyev, cochairman of the "Soyuz" deputies' association, by S. Karkhanin under the rubric "Kremlin Debates"—date, place of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction: "The Soyuz Position"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet's new working week started with a debate on the draft law on privatization. But an echo of the dispute which took place the previous day on the Cabinet of Ministers' position and its mutual relations with the president and parliament was clearly heard in the hall. "There are no differences between us," M.S. Gorbachev stated on Friday when he spoke to deputies, but many of them think differently.

How do the leaders of the "Soyuz" all-Union deputies' association regard the situation in the "triangle of power"? A. Chekhoyev, cochairman of the association and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, gives thought to this:

[Chekhoyev] It seems to me that the president has been landed in a complicated situation. If several republics have already come out against the draft Union Treaty agreed in Novo-Ogarevo, then with whom was it discussed? The famous "Nine Plus One" statement is by no means being fully implemented. The republic leaders refer to their parliaments' being in no hurry to state their opinions... In general there is a lack of certainty, and, in my opinion, this can be traced in the president's speech.

And the prime minister is convinced that the anticrisis program will remain only on paper if the government does not receive extra powers, especially in the finance and budget area. I asked to speak and said that we could

have declined to consider his request if, over the past days, the president had himself carried it out through a package of decrees. However, this had not been done. And the prime minister had achieved nothing.

I do not rule out the possibility that the president, having clarified the Supreme Soviet's position, intends to rely on it in future talks with the republics. One other thing. It looks as if M.S. Gorbachev, taking the new political influence of the elected Russian president into consideration, has decided to compromise more actively with him. It is hardly by chance that those associates of B.N. Yeltsin who so recently were criticizing the USSR president in such a zealous manner there and then rushed to the microphones in the hall and set about defending M.S. Gorbachev...

Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke about the Soyuz group in negative terms. But when I spoke, I also asked the question: Is it necessary to criticize us for fighting for the state's unity? Incidentally, we have always reacted to V.S. Pavlov's difficulties with understanding, and we entirely concur with him that it would be naive to rely on the West's helping us without getting anything in return. But it seems that the president has still not lost hope of foreign credits... I am more in agreement with the prime minister, the more so since information exists which, as the KGB chairman reported, confirms the government's prognoses.

I emphasize that we are all of us prepared to support the president. Otherwise, the mechanism to collect deputies' signatures to convene an extraordinary Congress would have been set in motion. We hope that the president's views will be more realistic and that the G-7 meeting will make a lot of things clear.

The accusation is being leveled at us that the Supreme Soviet, which according to the "Nine plus One" statement will soon be dissolving itself, is presently forming a bloc with the government in order to stay in power.

On the subject of the dissolution of the parliament, though, we should not be mealy-mouthed. I cannot bring to mind an occasion on which an executive wound up a legislature. But it looks as if this could happen here... We should remember the Constitution, which says that the president does not have the right to abolish us, whereas on the other hand the USSR Supreme Soviet may abolish the post of head of state.

If, toward the time when amendments to the Constitution become due, we are sure that this will help to preserve a unified state, it is likely that we will announce our own dissolution. On the other hand, when we have achieved what the people of all the nationalities have been demanding, why dissolve us? Incidentally, I believe that the new chamber structure envisaged in the "Nine Plus One" statement can also be organized on the basis of the existing Congress, that is without new elections.

At the moment there are plenty of reasons for concern here. For example, the new draft Union treaty dated 18 June. This says that the states constituting the Union independently determine their national-state and administrative-territorial systems. We consider this a conceptual "time bomb" placed under the USSR, because it divests it of any internal system whatsoever. Furthermore, it is incomprehensible how the republics are going to define the country's state border, or even its constitutional structure. Looking at the whole, there's monarchy here, anarchy there, and elsewhere—a republic.

A treaty for its own sake is no use to anyone, and a treaty which is capable of bringing us not to concord but to collapse is even more useless. And we believe that it is first of all necessary to make the amendments to the Constitution, with all the people discussing the questions of sovereignties and private ownership beforehand in a referendum. "The people are still immature and will not be able to understand what is proposed," the "democrats" object. But they themselves willingly use polls to promoting the ideas they favor, like mayoral power or the renaming of Leningrad.

In the recent referendum the people unequivocally came out in favor of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. However, against the people's will the Russian leaders are rejecting the socialist option in their draft Constitution. There is food for thought here. Especially if you take into consideration that the West is developing military hardware at an accelerated rate. The results of the Persian Gulf war showed that it would be a big mistake to "convert" our entire defense industry and science to the production of mowing machines and washtubs. So the unified and powerful Soviet state is being undermined by legislative as well as political and economic means. And the people should, I believe, have their say once more in a referendum.

Incidentally, it was a correct decision to finally publish the draft Law on Privatization, which has caused so many disputes. Let each person draw his own conclusions, since the law affects everyone's interests. I personally am convinced that in a consumer and raw materials market that is out of balance and with interregional cooperation having broken down, the proposed version of the draft is a blueprint for state suicide. How can planned-loss enterprises make out when they are denied the support of the profitmaking ones, which have passed into the hands of entrepreneurs? Moreover the classical political economists rightly wrote that it is easiest to make the maximum capital when a state is nascent or dying. Right now tomorrow's entrepreneurs are taking advantage of the bacchanalia of lawlessness to make wealth for themselves hand over fist.

Who is going to buy privatized apartments at a price of 4 million for three rooms? People doing an honest day's work used to be sure that sooner or later they would obtain accommodation. Yet what hope does even a higher education establishment graduate have, when he will never have a hope of amassing those millions? This is just one facet of the proposed innovations. There is also the collapse of social guarantees and the explosion of

unemployment. And what is this improved, fee-paying education and "inferior" free education?

Our group has insisted and will continue to insist: The USSR Constitution should operate over the country's entire territory. By what means? That is the president's business. In the Transcaucasus it is easy to buy a submachine gun for 30 rubles now: People who have lost their faith in everything are themselves forced to defend themselves and their families against militant extremists. We cannot just hope for everything to settle down of its own accord. We are approaching a situation in this country whereby, in accordance with the number of subjects of the federation, 53 presidents will emerge with their own constitutions and their own forces—such may be the cost of inertia and irresponsibility.

Marxist Party Fears 'Capitalist Dictatorship'

LD0207164891 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] The new Marxist Workers' Party functions in 120 cities in most of the republics of the Soviet Union. Eighty percent of the members are young industrial workers. According to one of the leaders, Yuriy Leonov, the party is against a market-oriented economy because it believes this will lead the country to capitalist dictatorship. The party calls for setting up workers' committees at all enterprises to run them as owners. Yuriy Leonov suggests convening a congress of soviets that would make decisions jointly with the country's parliament.

Debate on New Union Viewed

PM0207092991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Union Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Juridical Sciences Professor V. Danilenko: "On Path To New Union"]

[Text] A strange situation is taking shape in our country today. A way out has only just appeared for resolving one of the most important aspects of political transformations—the preparation of the new Union treaty on the basis of the well-known, very arduously achieved "Nine plus One" formula when a new problem immediately emerges. Some USSR Supreme Soviet deputies started worrying that they were seemingly being overlooked, that the question was being resolved without their participation. Moreover, something like a theoretical and legal substantiation was soon found: It was said that in our country there are not 15 republics, as we thought all this time, but 16. The 16th republic is the Union state as a whole. There was more: They started speaking of constitutional conflict, of the Federation Council exceeding its powers, of parallel power, and so forth. And a problem seemingly obvious from the viewpoint of sane logic proved hopelessly confused and turned upside down.

Of itself the situation is undoubtedly out of the ordinary and complex but from the legal viewpoint it is entirely soluble. If, of course, you are not afraid to call things by their names.

Thrust of Political Transformations

First of all it is essential finally to make it clear that today it is a case not of reorganizing and still less of improving the former federation. That is an absolutely futile business and, most importantly, one that no one needs. The basic premises on which this federation was based (the absolutization of the interests of the center, the open flouting of the rights of the subjects of the federation, disregard for their vital needs, the denial of their sovereign will, and so forth) were defective and fundamentally unacceptable. It is a case of creating a new state with a new, fundamentally different state structure. And since that is so, the relative role of individual elements of the constitutional structure in resolving the problems which arise inevitably changes.

The center with the participation of the Union republics could have perfected, could have improved the former state and legal institutions. Only the Union republics, that is the subjects of the future new state formation, can create a new state, a new Union, and define its power structures and the allocation of remits between them. The right of the deciding vote, the main prerogatives, and the possibility of taking final decisions is henceforth transferred there. Because only the subjects of the future new Union can be the source of power of this Union (and correspondingly of the new Union organs). From the legal viewpoint the opposite is simply devoid of sense. Union republics alone should determine which questions of political, economic, and other development it is more advantageous (advantageous primarily for themselves) for them to resolve together, handing over the relevant prerogatives to all-Union bodies. In other words, in relation to the former system the pyramid of power should be upturned. For a long time the center was unable or reluctant to understand that. And the fact that a change of positions took place at the April meeting in Novo-Ogarevo can be regarded as a real breakthrough. The path on which the USSR president has embarked is perhaps the only correct one.

But that is only one aspect of the question. Its other side is that the creation of a new stage is not proceeding in a vacuum, not on an uninhabited island. There is a state and economic organism which is an organic part of the international community. The Union organs of power which exist today are the official legal representative of that organism, the carrier of its domestic and international commitments. That is also an objective reality which cannot be ignored. And that is a problem on which in turn the Union republics have gotten stuck over, particularly those in which radically minded leaders are in power. After all, it is the Union organs which today still control (how effectively is another matter) the situation in the country. Consequently, if we want a transition to new state structures which is as orderly as

possible, with the least costs, in no way can we manage without the participation of and without cooperation with the existing Union organs of power. Today it seems the majority of republics understand that, albeit not without difficulty.

Actually, the well-known "Nine plus One" formula was also the result of an awareness of complex objective realities. The formula is expressively precise. It means that questions of the creation of a new state formation, of a new Union, are resolved by the Union republics themselves with the participation of the center. Here everything is put in its place. After all it is a case not of 10 participants in the talks process (still less of subjects of the future Union) but of Nine plus One.

Against this background the emergence of the concept of a "16th republic" is very notable. This concept is a classic model of legal casuistry. From the viewpoint of common sense, if there is one more republic then where is its own territory and population? From the legal viewpoint it directly contradicts articles 70-73 of the existing Constitution: This speaks of a Union of republics and not of a Republic standing above the subjects of the federation.

Yes, the Union has its own competence but the question of the allocation of competence is in no way identical to the question of fully independent statehood with all its inherent attributes. Actually, it is scarcely worth dwelling in detail on the legal aspect of the matter. The authors of the concept are skilled people and understood very well what they were doing. Here the main thing is political interest: rejecting the "Nine plus One" formula elaborated with such difficulty and equalizing the status and role of all participants in the talks, that is rejecting the very idea that the center does not and cannot have its own powers, that the source of its power lies only in prerogatives delegated by the republics, trying while reorganizing details to retain the old antidemocratic, antiperestroyka principle of the center's self-sufficient significance.

Place and Role of Union Parliament

The practical implementation of the above-mentioned formula has its own underwater reefs. Who is the "plus one"—the Union parliament, the president, the federation council? In other words, at what level should the Union organs of power be represented? Some deputies have formed the impression that the USSR Supreme Soviet is as it were edging away from taking part in the solution of the problem. That impression is wrong. Actually, there can be no straightforward answers here.

First, the Federation Council does indeed firmly retain the initiative in the elaboration of the problem. And that is natural. There is no cause to be offended here. We need a more narrowly staffed, more dynamic and efficient organ so that matters can make real headway and not drown in wordy arguments geared to an audience.

Second, parliament de facto is not removed from the problem. After all, by the decision of the fourth congress of people's deputies the preparatory committee for elaborating the Union treaty includes three representatives of the Union organs (in addition to the USSR president, there is the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the Union parliament Soviet of Nationalities). And they all work actively there.

Third, charges leveled against the Federation Council that it is exceeding its powers (it raises the question of the future new Constitution and even the schedule for its adoption) are unfounded. Several specialists assert that no constitutional conflict arises here because there is no violation of a single constitutional norm. Raising the question of the new constitution is by no means tantamount to elaborating and examining its text itself. There is an enormous distance between the two things.

Here one of today's most complex and important political questions inevitably arises—what is the role and place of the Union parliament in everything that is taking place and what are its prospects?

I absolutely disagree with the frequently encountered disparaging criticism of our parliament. It has done and is doing a very great deal, perhaps more than it is able to do. Many complaints may be leveled against it, but you only have to compare the parliamentary practice of previous years and present practice for it to become obvious that more has been done in two years than in the seven preceding decades. What future historians call this parliament—the "transitional," "preparatory," or "Lukyanov" parliament—is unimportant; it has already secured itself a place in the country's history.

At the same time we cannot fail to see another no less important circumstance: Time is essentially running out for the present Union parliament.

The Union parliament was formed on a one-party basis but today there is a multiparty system in the country—not yet plainly established, not permanently fixed, but still a multiparty system. Confirmation of this can be found in the presidential election in Russia, the first election to be held openly on a multiparty basis, its progress and outcome being predetermined by the clash between diametrically opposite political programs.

Next. Today all the republics have proclaimed their sovereignty, which changes the situation qualitatively. Moreover, some republics, as is well known, do not want to remain in the Union at all and are ostentatiously boycotting the work of parliament.

In parliament the national-state formations are still organized along Stalinist lines and have the relevant quotas of seats (and this is enshrined in the Regulations). But the legal status of many republics has already changed substantially and autonomous republics as such in fact no longer exist.

The parliament was formed under a different social structure of society. At the time cooperative members were reckoned to be a foreign body which had to be tolerated (not a single one of the seats allocated for public organizations was assigned them). But today there are already over 6 million people in the private sector of the economy...

In other words, if you held elections today the sociopolitical composition of parliament and its political identity would change substantially. I think that no one doubts that. Of course, there is an evolutionary process: Parliament is gradually changing, new groups are being created in it on a political basis, there is the rotation institution and others. But these changes are plainly not enough for the rapid changes in society and that means that the problem essentially is not being resolved but merely dragged out, promoting the surreptitious buildup of general sociopolitical tension.

We should be calm about what I have said. That is in the nature of periods of drastic revolutionary transformations. Let us recall that in revolutionary France of 1789-1795 five (!) constitutional and legal acts (two declarations of human rights and three constitutions) were adopted in a brief period; representative institutions were correspondingly replaced one after another. Incidentally, the parliament newly elected in our country will probably also "age" prematurely (unless, of course, there is an accident, if reforms develop in an upward direction). And therefore one cannot help recalling an idea heard during the first congress of people's deputies—that the term of office of the newly created representative organ of power be limited to a shorter period. From the constitutional and legal viewpoint the idea is undoubtedly vulnerable, it is easy to dispute it. But there is political sense in it: With the successful development of the transformations this would rule out the possibility of parliament's conversion into a conservative organ, into an instrument for curbing what is new.

In connection with the above it is extraordinarily important what position the Union parliament itself adopts in the situation which is taking shape today: Whether it goes halfway to meet the progressive changes or insists on retaining the entire term for its powers. There are tendencies among some deputies toward the latter. And these are dangerous tendencies. Because behind them one can easily detect concern primarily for the personal interests of a new generation of politicians who have tasted power and are reluctant to relinquish it (incidentally, many deputies who have proved their authority and qualification for the job will probably be reelected and it is precisely those who have the least chance here who often adopt the most implacable positions). In addition this could lead to the point where political contradictions will take on the form of an institutional conflict. And that will seriously complicate the already extremely difficult situation, blocking the emerging prospect of a settlement of the problems facing us.

What Is the Way Out?

First of all talk about the immediate dissolution of the Union parliament heard from some radicals is in principle intolerable. On the contrary, parliament should galvanize its activity still further. Because without its most active participation at this crucial frontier it is virtually impossible to ensure a more or less harmonious transition to new state structures without significant losses.

Parliament can and must play its part in preparing the new Union Treaty but only as a participant in the relevant process. The decisive word here should be left to the republics. Claims to leading, determining importance from the union parliament would contradict the legal logic of the transformations, merely complicating headway.

Parliament must continue work on legal backup for all the reforms it carries out and primarily in the economic sphere, without allowing delays or the disruption of the pact which has been assumed.

Parliament must prepare and adopt a new law on elections. This task is very important since the nature of our new parliament and consequently the way in which and the pace at which further transformations take place in the country will depend on the quality of this law—here parliament will be required to display all the legislative experience and professionalism it has accumulated.

With the creation of a new Union the formation of new all-union organs of power, that is the holding of presidential and parliamentary elections, will obviously become inevitable. But again the old organs of power and the present parliament must function until the mandates of the newly elected deputies are approved. That perhaps does not coincide with universally accepted world parliamentary practice but for us it is essential. To allow the anarchy of lack of control over the most important levers of the country's management in this extremely complex and critical situation even for a brief period is impossible—the consequences could be unpredictable.

About the Constitution. Of course, the newly instituted Union of sovereign republics will require a new Constitution. Its initial premises are predetermined—it will be based on the text of the new Union Treaty. The schedule for its adoption has also been suggested—six months after the republics conclude the new Union treaty (incidentally, the schedule could be tighter: After all, the relevant constitutional commission has been working for two years now—no small time for considering and preparing everything properly). The question is how the new Constitution will be adopted and by what organ.

Here various viewpoints are being voiced, including inside parliament itself. And that is understandable—in our country today parliament is already really functioning on a pluralist basis. In addition there is no doubt that it is essential to be concerned for the compromises

already reached and to seek agreement in society—otherwise the process of transformations will come to a halt. One option for the possible solution of the problem which, incidentally, is enshrined in the Novo-Ogarevo agreements, is the active participation of the representative organs of power which now exist in the preparation of a new Constitution. There is a basis for this—the parliament can and must seek its place in the process of transformations. But as an alternative we also fully allow the option whereby the new Constitution will be adopted by new organs of power. We should not forget that, if only as an argument in the dialogue with conservatively minded parliamentarians who clearly do not like the agreement reached between the republics.

In speaking of new organs of power it is not hard to predict objections—how many elections will there be in that case? Many? But there is no other way out if, of course, we make a definitive choice in favor of democracy. After all, democracy is an extremely inconvenient thing, as W. Churchill used to say, the worst possible state form, but so far no one has thought up anything better. And that is by no means a joke.

As a historical example I shall cite France once again: After World War II there were seven nationwide votes (including three referendums and the election of two constituent assemblies) here in the course of virtually just one year. Yet their situation was far more complex than ours: The country had only just been liberated from the fascist occupation, the economy was destroyed, ruined, plundered, and there were heavy human losses... But the French people, in spite of everything created their new statehood by consistently democratic means.

Thus the optimum option is that after signing the new Union treaty there are elections of the constituent assembly , the adoption of a new constitution, and the formation of new union organs of power on its basis. All questions connected with the legitimization of power, without which radical social transformations are impossible, will thus be eliminated forever.

To be honest I am not sure that we will manage all this. There are no strong democratic traditions. And therefore the most serious political reasons will probably be found to curtail and simplify the procedure for the establishment of the new statehood. Here a conundrum inevitably arises: What should follow what, should parliamentary elections be held first and a new Constitution adopted later, or the other way round? It is illogical to hold parliamentary elections first—after all, the elected organ will still not have new constitutional status. If it is the other way round there will be no new representative organ to adopt the new Constitution. Naturally, people mention the present Union parliament. But again the Congress of People's deputies is abolished with the signing of the new Union Treaty—that is a question which has already been decided. That means that there remains only the USSR Supreme Soviet, which the people did not elect, which was formed indirectly, and which consequently can in no way be regarded as a representative organ.

Actually, that is not the only point. Jurisprudence "specialists" like the authors of the concept of the "16th republic" will probably think up something. The main thing lies elsewhere. A society which allows deviations from democracy, which sacrifices its basic postulates always suffers itself from such pliancy. Our own history can serve as confirmation of that.

Senior Officials Under Corruption Probe

91UN1987A Moscow TRUD in Russian 28 Jun 91 p 1

[Article by O. Osipov: "They Shed Tears As They Have To Leave Their Dachas"]

[Text] Now I know with certainty that at present our highest echelons of power love cooperatives a great deal and support privatization for all it is worth, whatever one may say. Proof of that can be found in the materials discussed yesterday at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission on privileges and benefits. While our parliamentarians are arguing about removing government from economy and are pondering the issue of socialist choice, the Cabinet of Ministers, central ministries, and agencies are hastily selling off state dachas and other items to private owners.

This "creeping privatization," as the process was termed at the session, was started by N. Ryzhkov, who signed the order last summer allowing the sale of dachas to high officials from the former Council of Ministers. He was also among the first people who made use of the order as he bought a dacha with total living space of 368 square meters and a 1.4-hectare lot. After reevaluation the dacha was appraised at 78,017 rubles [R].

Right after him, the new "economic methods" were exercised by A. Biryukova (she bought a dacha with a residual balance sheet value of R75,331 for R18,097); L. Voronin, who paid less than half the residence price; V. Savakov, M. Shkabardnya, A. Sterligov, and other top officials. All these operations incurred losses of R206,226. Incidentally not a single government leader provided the income source declaration which they, the government officials themselves, invented.

How much they love the cooperative movement can be seen from the fact that state dachas are being handed over to cooperatives, which is another method of privatization. It is interesting that all the utility and service systems, everything that accounts for a big share of dacha value, are still paid for by the government.

It is hard to disagree with the commission members who say that the biggest impression was left on them by the list of cooperative members. The "Nazaryevo" cooperative, for instance, includes USSR Cabinet of Ministers office manager I. Prostyakov, his deputy A. Masterkov, Cabinet economic administration chief V. Kozelko and

his deputy Yu. Yelfimov, trade union chairman M. Anfilov, former Council of Ministers office manager A. Smirtyukov, and Deputy Minister of Trade P. Kondrashov, as well as two representatives of the Odintsovo gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee].

The commission also disclosed some facts about property being sold off from government dachas, rest homes, and boarding houses belonging to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers administration, and the prices were artificially lowered. Marshal S. Akhromeyev, for instance, paid just R215 for three "ZIL" refrigerators and another marshal, S. Sokolov, had to pay a whole fortune of...R29 for a similar refrigerator.

Generally speaking, our top officials' love of relaxing in the countryside turns out to be rather costly for our taxpayers. For instance, the budgeted dacha construction costs allowed by the government for the Ministry of Defense were exceeded four or five times. The dacha for our main defender, D. Yazov, cost R249,400. But what is most important is the fact that our top officials do not want to part with their dachas for anything, in spite of all the numerous decisions and decrees, and they are putting all kinds of obstacles in the commission's path. I learned that from commission secretary E. Pamfilova, USSR people's deputy from trade unions. Last fall, by the way, she was the first person to start talking about the "wild" privatization in the country's parliament.

"We have met with incidents of concealment of the truth and deliberate false information," Ella Aleksandrovna says. "And it was hard in general to resume the work of our commission after the second congress; it started working actively as late as the end of last year and it had all new members. As for the subject of today's session, the main reason for our present situation with the state dachas, I think, lies in the absence of any control over the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, over ministries and agencies, and in the total secrecy of all pertinent information."

The session passed a resolution which says: "A system of illegal economic privileges has been established over many years in the top echelons of power. The system is still regulated by statutory acts (including secret ones) and it is contributing to the corruption and moral degradation of our officials. This system...is now in contradiction with our course toward democratic reforms and it serves to undermine the prestige of power."

The commission presented some proposals to the USSR president and the Supreme Soviet of our country aimed at suspending any sales of state dachas or dacha property until the adoption of the Law on denationalization and privatization of items of the social sphere, and suggested that Prime Minister V. Pavlov be heard at one of the parliament sessions in connection with the disclosed abuses in utilizing and distributing government property by our officials. Some other concrete proposals were made, including one to the USSR Procurator General which recommends evaluation of all sale and purchase deals from the legal point of view and the institution of proper legal proceedings against those officials who tried to obstruct the audit by the commission members by deliberately providing false information.

Primary Organizations Urged To Reassert Role

PM0207104991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with V.B. Nosov, chairman of CPSU Central Committee Council of Primary Party Organization Secretaries, by N. Lyaporov under "Over to You, Primary Organization!" rubric; date, place not given: "Will the Market 'Consume' the Communists?"]

[Text] Vladimir Borisovich Nosov, secretary of the party committee of Moscow's I.A. Likhachev Motor Vehicle Plant (ZIL), now has a few more cares (although he had more than enough before!). At its first session recently the CPSU Central Committee Council of Primary Party Organization Secretaries elected him its chairman. It was no accident that trust was shown in him. The Motor Vehicle Plant workers' 9,000-strong party organization is rich in experience and good traditions, and there is something to be learned here even today, during the difficult time of perestroyka.

The council has defined the main areas of its activity, mindful of the new conditions and the complex problems which life itself has set Communists. So what does it intend to tackle first of all? My conversation with V. Nosov began with this question.

"First of all," Vladimir Borisovich said, "I would like to emphasize that such a council is simply essential today, and this has been felt by everyone—both down below and up above. Why? The situation in collectives and primary organizations has changed drastically, the old work methods are not suitable, but we have not yet learned how to operate in the new way. And yet there is already some experience in the provinces, but what do we know about it? Let us take account of the fact that in recent years party committees—from the Central Committee to the rayon committee—have also grown cool toward the practice of primary organizations, as it were."

[Lyaporov] Do you consider the secretaries council one form of such ties?

[Nosov] Yes, and a successful one, in my opinion. Our own experience has convinced us of this: Such a council has already been operating for more than a year at ZIL, whose subdivisions are scattered around a number of oblasts in the country. What is more, contacts within the framework of the whole sector have recently begun expanding. For example, we secretaries of the party committees of large enterprises—the Volga and Nizhniy Novgorod Motor Vehicle Plants, the Kama Truck Plant—regularly consult one another and discuss how

better to act today. The experience so far is not great, and yet it could come in handy in the practice of the all-union secretaries council.

But this is one side of the coin. There is another side which, I believe, is no less important. In our view, people "up above" have increasingly frequently begun adopting decisions without asking the opinion of those "down below." Then it is "suddenly" discovered that the decision proves to be far from irreproachable, and sometimes it hits hard precisely at the working person. People grumble, and the first to be subjected to this counterblast are precisely the Communists and primary organizations. Take, for example, that price hike...

[Lyaporov] Only that was not an internal party action but a government one. What could the CPSU's primary organizations have done there?

[Nosov] True, it was a government action, but then ours is the ruling party. People are accustomed to its being answerable for everything, and its grass-roots cells are right here, alongside, and are called to account first!

Is it possible to deliver us, I mean primary organizations, from such a practice? I think so. We want to raise the prestige of primary organizations. Their voice must always be heard when a major decision is being prepared and adopted. And we hope that our secretaries council will serve this aim.

[Lyaporov] The following motif frequently recurs in the editorial mailbag: The role and prestige of Communists in collectives have declined since primary organizations were "separated" from economic and production matters. Hence their confusion and passiveness, it is said. But what is your opinion and that of your Communists about this?

[Nosov] How is it possible to live and work in a thousands-strong labor family and overlook the problems of concern to people? Such a stance is ruinous for a party organization.

[Lyaporov] Not so long ago the party committees of many enterprises frequently acted the role of "fixers" with regard to supplies. This seems even then not to have been considered a particular prowess...

[Nosov] Of course, there is no need to run after nuts and bolts. It is time to get away from many old habits, but how can we be aloof from questions of order and the rhythmic working of the enterprise? Profit is king, but how can there be any profit if production is being wrecked? Ties with subcontractors have been disrupted, and our assembly line is continually faltering because of the shortage of components and assemblies. Virtually the entire managerial apparatus is struggling with this problem. And a secretary of a shop party organization or the party committee will hardly enhance his prestige if he stands aside in such a situation. For instance, I have repeatedly had to turn for assistance to my colleagues at the Chelyabinsk Metallurgical Plant and on the Moscow Railroad, and I can say that our suggestions are usually treated with understanding. But the main way, of course, is to enhance the competence and responsibility of Communist leaders and specialists.

Incidentally, these cadres of ours—from foremen to leaders of the plant's major subdivisions—were and still are the mainstay of the party committee and of shop organizations. None of them has been in a hurry to place his party card on the table, however hard things have been. These people combine competence with high responsibility to working people. A very important quality! As for economic concerns, I will repeat that there is probably no getting away from them today, when the market is taking shape. Another point is that they must not overshadow the chief thing—the economic and political training of people for the new conditions and the elaboration of measures for the working people's social protection. At ZIL our Communists have a specific action program. It was adopted at a plant party conference at the end of last year.

[Lyaporov] Thus, the practice of your Communists refutes the opinion that the intrusion of market relations automatically debars the party organization from plant affairs? And yet some people assiduously drag into this "convenient" version the idea of expelling party committees from enterprises. They say they are no use here now. It is currently being said that "The market will comsume the party organization."

[Nosov] This is the perfect dream of all Communists' enemies. I am convinced that there are no objective reasons for primary organizations to leave enterprises. And there are no legitimate grounds for banning them—clear-cut explanations were provided in this regard at a recent session of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, and they have been published. So everything depends on ourselves. If we are able to understand and express the interests of working people and attract everything honest and healthy in the workers movement, the collectives will follow us; and if we are not able to, we must ask ourselves: Why?

During the reports and elections sharp open debates took place in our shop meetings, and all who wished to participate in them, including representatives of the "democratic platform," did so. The workers listened to everyone and pondered, but preferred the Communists' program. And nobody once raised the question of the party organization's leaving the enterprise.

Incidentally, envoys from the miners, who were on strike at the time, also visited us. I don't know whether the miners themselves sent them. They undertook agitation work: Workers must help each other out, they said. Our motor vehicle plant workers said this in reply: We support a number of your demands. But... striking means cutting off the branch you are sitting on. We are not rich as it is, but by sitting idle we will be reduced to total poverty...

Renewal is what life demands of Communists. Of course, we favor strengthening ties with the workers movement. But this concerns not only us. At the conference in December my colleagues, the primary organization secretaries, rebuked the Central Committee—rightly, it seems to me—for taking less interest in the socioeconomic position of labor collectives. No strong link with the grass roots was felt. True, there are now, in my opinion, reassuring changes. [Nosov ends]

Our conversation had already been prepared for printing, but on looking through it once again Vladimir Borisovich took alarm: Rather little had been said about the work of the council itself.

[Lyaporov] But it is only a few days old, so is it not a bit early to ask?

[Nosov] But the first steps, at least. For example, we are involved in preparing a scientific and practical conference which the CPSU Central Committee will hold. One of the most important topics is the primary party organization in the labor collective. And again: It has turned out that there is not a single representative of ministerial party organizations on the council. An obvious mistake. We have submitted a proposal to rectify the mistake, and secretaries of ministries' party committees have gathered at the Central Committee...

Well, these really are the first steps. But everything still lies ahead for the council...

Documents on IZVESTIYA Dispute Circulated

PM0207111691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report from the Kremlin by IZVESTIYA parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "The Founder and the Newspaper"]

[Text] The morning's joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet fifth session began 28 June with a discussion of the work schedule. Parliament has only two weeks left before the summer recess, and much still has to be done. Suffice it to recall some of the draft legislative acts that are to be discussed—the draft Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation of the USSR and the Republics, the draft antimonopoly legislation, the draft law on foreign investments. The Supreme Soviet also proposes to hold hearings on the course of implementation of the Union budget in 1991, and on 9 July debates on the draft Union Treaty will begin, and will last at least two days. In short, the schedule is extremely busy, time for work on committees and commissions is being reduced as far as possible, and Saturday is no longer regarded as a day off.

But despite this tight schedule, not everything that it was planned to do at the fifth session found a place in the schedule, which naturally prompted protests and discussion. And moreover the rapid pace of recent events is setting new questions for the country's parliament. Thus, for instance, during this debate Deputy A. Kuzmin submitted a proposal to discuss a package of materials on the subject of the situation at the newspaper IZVESTIYA.

These materials were distributed at the Supreme Soviet before the start of the morning sitting. The reason for their appearance was a question, signed by more than 20 deputies, addressed by Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov. The document expresses the view that the appointments made 7 June 1991 to leading posts at the editorial office of IZVESTIYA and its supplement NEDELYA were made in violation of the Law on the Press; the authors of the question feel profoundly concerned about this, and regard it as a new move in the offensive against glasnost. A similar question was sent to A. Lukyanov by Deputy M. Poltoranin. By way of answer to these questions, two other documents have also been distributed—a report prepared by the Supreme Soviet legal services, and a reply prepared by USSR General Prosecutor N. Trubin. Both documents find that the appointment of the IZVESTIYA leaders was lawful.

The IZVESTIYA package also contains a brief report signed by A. Lukyanov saying that an exchange of opinions took place on this question at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session 25 June. The majority of the Presidium members, with the exception of I. Laptev and Yu. Ryzhov, saw no need to reconsider the decision adopted. The package of documents is completed by a appeal from I. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, to the people's deputies. In this appeal one of the leaders of the Union parliament explains to his colleagues the position he adopted at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session.

In I. Laptev's opinion, the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman substantially violated the prerogatives of the Supreme Soviet Presidium as founder and publisher of IZVESTIYA by single-handedly adopting the decision to appoint D. Mamleyev first deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA and establishing the corresponding staffing levels (the editorial office now has three first deputy chief editors). In other words, the Soviet of the Union chairman says in his appeal, D. Mamleyev's appointment was in violation of Article 15 of the Law on the Press. Consequently it is unlawful and should be revoked. Only after this can the candidacy in question be examined by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, provided, of course, that the Presidium is still the founder and publisher of IZVESTIYA.

The appointment of V. Sevruk, first deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA, as editor of the weekly supplement NEDELYA is also a violation of the Law on the Press, the appeal goes on to say. For 30 years the founder and publisher of NEDELYA has been the newspaper IZVESTIYA, in the person of its editorial collegium. It is the IZVESTIYA editorial collegium that has the right to make appointments here. Furthermore that is the general principle governing any newspaper appointments: In practice, every employee of the editorial office or its

supplements is appointed or dismissed solely by a collective decision of the editorial collegium, although the chief editor submits the proposal. This situation and this right of the editorial collegium have grown up historically—every member of the collegium was originally appointed by a decision of the CPSU Central Committee, and this appointment was duplicated by a corresponding document from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. And the members of the editorial collegium were not appointed simply as desk chiefs, but as IZVESTIYA editors with responsibility for specific areas, that is to say, the editorial collegium is the collective leader of the newspaper, and its role can not be ignored, whether on formal, practical, or ethical grounds.

Moreover, I. Laptev writes, the editor of NEDELYA is ex officio a deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA, but not vice versa. Therefore, in his view, it can not be justified to argue that since NEDELYA is headed by a deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA, the appointment in question is simply a reshuffle involving moving one deputy to a different position, and is therefore wholly within the power of the chief editor. I. Laptev regards this argument as an attempt to "justify" an unlawful decision.

The appeal also stresses that these appointments were not prompted by any practical necessity. After the attempt by the Presidium in early February to discuss the IZVESTIYA situation, the question was exhausted. I think, I. Laptev writes, that the Supreme Soviet Presidium members are morally entitled to take this view, since no additional information on the problems discussed at that time has been submitted to us, and the Presidium has taken no decisions. The newspaper has continued to come out, and technical and financial issues were considered in accordance with the usual procedure. It is therefore my contention, I. Laptev writes, that either this is a case of the Supreme Soviet chairman disregarding the role and rights of the Presidium and an example of our being excluded from decisionmaking, or else the chairman has information on this question which for some reason he has not made available to us, which, however, does not give him the right to act single-handedly as founder-publisher of IZVESTIYA; it is self-evident that this is not an accidental blunder or a technical error, otherwise there would be no need to drag the USSR president into a matter which it was not worth "troubling" the Presidium members about, or to seek to obtain his signature on the proposal of IZVESTIYA Chief Editor N. Yefimov on the candidacies in question.

By supporting, or more accurately authorizing, or—even more accurately—carrying out these cadre appointments in such an unusual way, the Supreme Soviet chairman was taking on a very great responsibility, the document says. I very much hope that my prediction proves mistaken, but there are too many indications that these appointments will be harmful, rather than beneficial, to the cause, I. Laptev writes.

In conclusion the author of the appeal stresses that he is motivated to bring his views to the attention of the deputies by his profound concern that if the legislators themselves start treating laws in the way that the esteemed USSR Supreme Soviet chairman treated the Law on the Press on this occasion, all our talk about building a rule-of-law state and establishing the rule of law will turn out to be yet another large-scale deception of the people...

Deputy Kuzmin's proposal to discuss all these documents met no objection from the chair.

The deputies then embarked on the debate on questions of privatization. Once again it became clear from the outset that these debates would not be easy. By the first break, not even the first article of the draft law had been passed. In the event the Soviet of the Union voted for the proposed version, but the required majority was not achieved in the Soviet of Nationalities.

Validity of IZVESTIYA Appointments Confirmed

PM0207140991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 91 Union Edition p 3

[Feature under the "Returning to What Was Printed" rubric comprising two-paragraph IZVESTIYA introduction, findings of USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat legal services, and letter from N.S. Trubin, USSR general prosecutor and actual state councillor of justice, to USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A.I. Lukyanov: "Once Again About the Founder and the Newspaper"]

[Text] In a report by parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev in IZVESTIYA No. 153 the newspaper reported on Deputy A. Kuzmin's proposal to discuss the package of materials disseminated at the USSR Supreme Soviet in connection with the appointment of Comrades D. Mamleyev and V. Sevruk to leading posts on IZVESTIYA and its supplement NEDELYA. The reportage cited in detail an appeal from I. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, who considered that these appointments had been made in violation of the law and were not dictated by business necessity.

Today we publish materials on this same problem prepared by the USSR Supreme Soviet's legal services and by USSR General Prosecutor N. Trubin.

On The Appeals Of A Group Of USSR People's Deputies Concerning Appointments To IZVESTIYA And NEDELYA

In connection with the appeals of a group of USSR people's deputies (Yu.N. Afanasyev, O.T. Bogomolov, Yu.D. Chernichenko, M.N. Poltoranin, and others) of 14 and 18 June 1991 concerning the appointments of IZVESTIYA's first deputy chief editor and also the editor of the weekly NEDELYA we report the following.

IZVESTIYA's chief editor appointed Comrade D.F. Mamleyev as first deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA

and Comrade V.N. Sevruk, this newspaper's first deputy chief editor, as editor of NEDELYA, mindful of the fact that, prior to this, he had, in accordance with the distribution of duties, been in charge of IZVESTIYA's supplement.

As leader of the organ which is IZVESTIYA's founder, USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A.I. Lukyanov gave his consent to these appointments.

The said appointments were made in accordance with the USSR Law "On the Press and Other Mass Media," USSR labor and other legislation, and also established practice.

Under Article 15 of the Law on the Press, the founder of a mass medium, in this case the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, appoints or releases the chief editor, but not deputy editors or other members of the editorial board. Thus, this appointment of IZVESTIYA's first deputy chief editor does not run counter to the said article of the law.

As regards the appointment of NEDELYA's chief editor, it should be pointed out that the weekly is a supplement to the newspaper IZVESTIYA and not an independent mass medium. And this is recorded in this periodical's registration certificate. In the present situation Article 15 of the Law on the Press cannot be fully extended to relations connected with the appointment of NEDELYA's editor.

In accordance with long-standing practice, NEDELYA's editor was appointed by IZVESTIYA's chief editor with the consent of the leadership of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Thus, in 1982 Comrade Yu.T. Gribov was appointed NEDELYA's editor on the instructions of the secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium by order of IZVESTIYA's chief editor. Comrade V.A. Syrokomskiy was appointed in the same way in 1986. They were released from their posts with the consent of the leadership of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium by orders of IZVESTIYA's chief editor. Even now this practice does not run counter to the Law on the Press.

Proceeding from the aforesaid, IZVESTIYA's chief editor had a right to make the said appointments of this newspaper's first deputy editor and of NEDELYA's chief editor. References to a claim that in this case a decision of IZVESTIYA's Editorial Board was not adopted are untenable.

Taking this into account, the orders on the appointment of Comrades D.F. Mamleyev and V.N. Sevruk are legitimate and were issued within the powers of IZVESTIYA's chief editor.

To Comrade A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet

Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich!

At your request the USSR Prosecutor's Office has checked compliance with legality in the appointment of Comrade V.N. Sevruk, first deputy chief editor of the newspaper IZVESTIYA SOVETOV NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV SSSR, as chief editor of the newspaper NEDELYA.

It has been established that on 30 August 1990 the USSR State Committee for the Press registered the periodical NEDELYA as a supplement to the newspaper IZVESTIYA SOVETOV NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV SSSR, which is NEDELYA's founder.

Comrade V.N. Sevruk, first deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA, was appointed to the vacant post of chief editor of NEDELYA on the instruction of Comrade N.I. Yefimov, chief editor of IZVESTIYA, 7 June 1991. Here a reference was made to an instruction by the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman. In fact the question of the appointment of IZVESTIYA's first deputy chief editor as NEDELYA's editor was only agreed with the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman—but this does not have independent juridical significance. This agreement was evidently occasioned by the fact that the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in accordance with Article 118 of the USSR Constitution, heads the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is IZVESTIYA's founder.

The appointment of Comrade V.N. Sevruk to the post of NEDELYA chief editor by decision of IZVESTIYA's chief editor does not run counter to existing legislation.

Under Article 15 of the USSR Law of 12 June 1990 "On the Press and Other Mass Media," the editor (chief editor) is appointed and released by the founder of a mass medium or is elected and released according to the procedure provided for in the editorial statute. The editorial statutes of NEDELYA and also IZVESTIYA have not yet been confirmed, and so in this case the decision of the chief editor's appointment depends only on the founder, i.e. the newspaper IZVESTIYA.

In accordance with Articles 2 and 15 of the aforesaid law, newspapers and other mass media are represented by editorial offices. The work of the editorial office and the editorial board is directed by the editor (chief editor), who represents the mass medium in relations with various state and public organizations and citizens' associations.

Thus, IZVESTIYA's chief editor is endowed with the powers to act in the name of this mass medium, which is, at the same time, NEDELYA's founder. There are no grounds here for limiting his right to appoint NEDELYA's chief editor. No other procedure for resolving this question is provided for either by the law or by the editorial statute.

The arguments that NEDELYA's chief editor should be appointed by the editorial board or by the editorial office collective are not based on existing normative acts.

In the said circumstances there are no grounds for intervention by the prosecutor.

[Signed] N.S. Trubin, USSR general prosecutor and actual state councillor of justice.

Protest Over Editor's Appointment Viewed

91UN1982A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 28 Jun 91 p 3

[Article by E. Tserkover, member of NEDELYA editorial board: "Reputations, Reputations..."]

[Text] **Our poor NEDELYA: What a scandal has developed within and around it! Press conferences, radio and television interviews, rejoinders in the press, more and more meetings of workers adopting protest resolutions... Several publications at once distorted the information: "27 of the 33 NEDELYA workers stated that it would be impossible to work under the leadership of the new editor in chief who has such a bad reputation (he held a post in the ideological division of the CPSU Central Committee)."**

27 out of 33! Impressive. But who were these 27 workers?

Five proofreaders, two retouchers, a composition (make-up) editor, a technical secretary, the artist who composes mock-ups of the newspaper columns... Incidentally, this last person was a student who had worked on the weekly for several months and had decided to turn in his resignation long before the new editor in chief arrived, and he scribbled the protest letter on his way out the door: Why not, if they want it so much... With all due respect to the proofreaders, the retouchers, the secretaries, and the make- up editors, it would be stretching things to call them journalists. But it is more effective to do so, and the matter immediately gains an ideological foundation.

And so it turns out that when it comes to journalists as such there were 17 and not 27.

The letter of protest, which was addressed to the IZVESTIYA editorial board, was not signed by a single department editor at NEDELYA. It was not signed by the weekly's senior writer A. Yevseyev-Kogan, who has been working there since the first issue. The photographic reporter V. Akhlomov and I, who have been working there since 1960, did not sign it. I asked the editor of the correspondence department, O. Povetkin, who is about 20 years younger than I am, why he did not sign it. "I do not think I have the right to say that I will not work with a man whom I do not know at all," responded O. Povetkin. V.N. Sevruk's predecessors—M.A. Tseytlin, V.A. Arkhangelskiy, Yu.T. Gribov, V.A. Syrokomoskiy—were also appointed without our opinion being asked. We are not working for the current editor in chief but for NEDELYA.

Aleksandr Lvovich Plyushch, NEDELYA editor in chief for the first 10 years of its existence, came to the post with the reputation of an "incorrigible old crab": That is what he was called at the youth newspaper where he worked before. But at NEDELYA Plyushch became the instigator of all the fun and the inspiration for some of the most unexpected newspaper articles.

For 26 years any worker at NEDELYA could, if necessary, simply drop into the editor in chief's office. V.A. Syrokomskiy, who came to us at the end of 1986 with the reputation of an intellectual and a democrat, a brilliant creative individual, made this his very first order: Ask for an appointment through the secretary and then wait until I call you. Anyone who was in a hurry to report something and simply ran in without being called was thrown out ("Get out of here!"), whether it was a member of the editorial board or an aging woman. Syrokomskiy immediately did away with the rubric "Editor's Column" which had been popular with the readers for 20 years (other publications adopted it) as well as a number of other traditional rubrics. Soon after he arrived the best people left: An. Makarov, V. Kichin. The personnel selection conducted by Syrokomskiy began to turn the collective into a contingent.

He would not let USSR People's Deputy Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov appear on page 13 of NEDELYA! He would not allow it and that was all there was to it! And nobody who is protesting out of principle now would have done that then.

A plan for the next issue was read at one of the planning sessions: "The guest for page 13 will be the writer Veniamin Kaverin." "No!" exclaimed Syrokomskiy. "Not good enough!" Those in attendance started whispering. "Who is not good enough? We, perhaps?" As editor of page 13 I had to say: "Vitaliy Aleksandrovich, we coordinated the idea of having Kaverin on page 13 with the official secretary. Kaverin has already been invited, and for page 13." "Well, put the interview somewhere at the end of the issue," Syrokomskiy answered. "But he will not be on page 13!" The lord and master. And nobody submitted their resignation as a sign of protest.

Syrokomskiy himself invited Vitaliy Korotich to appear on page 13 and the interview was prepared, but still it was never published. The same thing happened with Albert Likhanov: Syrokomskiy ordered to have him invited and when it was done he withdrew his invitation. I took the liberty of noting: "You cannot invite people as guests and then slam the door in their faces. It is better not to invite them at all." "And who do you have in mind?" Syrokomskiy asked. "Kaverin, for example." "Well, I hope you have not had any more problems with Kaverin" (since the writer had already committed suicide and would not reproach anybody any more).

Syrokomskiy preferred to spend his vacation in the sanatorium of the CPSU Central Committee. From there he supervised us actively by telephone. He called the young worker A. Perevalova: "What are you doing?" She explained that she was preparing a conversation with P.G. Bunich, who at that time had just been elected

chairman of the USSR Council of Renters and Entrepreneurs, for page 13. "Bunich is not a figure who should be on page 13!" Syrokomskiy stated, and cancelled the assignment. The confused Perevalova went to her senior comrades. "Prepare it, prepare the conversation with Bunich," she was advised by acting chief I.A. Serkov. After a certain amount of time the new members of the CPSU Central Committee were announced and they included Bunich. And Syrokomskiy telephoned from the sanatorium: Invite Bunich to appear on page 13.

A couple of days ago we read in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI that the representative of this publication told B.N. Yeltsin about Sevruk's appointment to NEDELYA, and Boris Nikolayevich exclaimed: "My God!"

But nobody exclaimed "My God!" when, on orders from Syrokomskiy, a young NEDELYA reporter began to gather "compromising evidence" on Yeltsin, to call the southern sanatorium and find out how many times a year and for how many days Yeltsin vacations there, how much the pass costs, whether he is alone or not... Many people at NEDELYA knew about this phone call (ordered by Syrokomskiy), but, I repeat, nobody exclaimed: "My God!"

In planning sessions and emergency meetings Syrokomskiy told me time and again: "Learn from MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI!" He ignored my arguments that NEDELYA and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI were different publications. Once I sent him a memo in which I protested against the numerous attacks on me. And what happened? In a half hour the forbidding trio of the NEDELYA party bureau had come to "straighten me out." I asked: "What is the party bureau doing here? A member of the editorial board wrote a memo to the editor in chief." But Syrokomskiy said "it is necessary" and these three answered "consider it done." One member reproached me in a familiar way: "Do you think you are the only one he is rude to? He is rude to everyone!" More evidence of "high principles." This former party bureau member today is in the vanguard of the conflict that has developed at NEDELYA.

I did not understand which one was the real Syrokomskiy: When he told me to learn from MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI or when he refused to let Sakharov appear on page 13. Now this person, who vacations regularly at the sanatorium of the CPSU Central Committee, has stopped paying his party dues and, according to rumors, intends to edit the newspaper BEDNOTA. Funny. This is also a reputation.

It is as though the people who started the scandal at NEDELYA because of the arrival of Sevruk had not heard that three years ago Sevruk, who was the first deputy editor in chief of IZVESTIYA, was appointed to be the official in charge of NEDELYA. That is, three years ago he was placed over NEDELYA and had the right to demand explanations from its leaders and to make recommendations; he could demand the withdrawal of any material from an issue (or publication). He could have, but he did not do this once in three years.

All the NEDELYA workers without exception wanted the editor in chief to be I.A. Serkov, a talented young editor whose management of the weekly after Syrokomskiy left was perceived as a gulp of freedom. But the editor in chief of IZVESTIYA made a different decision. It was by no means dictated by an underestimation of Serkov's worth but solely by the inevitable shifts among the IZVESTIYA chief editors.

At meetings with workers from the weekly Sevruk announced that he did not intend to change anything, that he liked NEDELYA the way it had been up to that point. Incidentally, once again anyone who wants to can go into the office of the NEDELYA editor in chief without any bureaucratic rituals.

Nonetheless the conflict has not died down. Certain "big-time patriots" of NEDELYA love it so much that they are prepared not to publish it at all as long as they do not "compromise their principles."

Of course, life will ultimately show who was who. So many reputations have not been born out in reality...

Journalists Concerned About Newspaper Conflict

LD0107223291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1900 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] The executive secretariat of the USSR Union of Journalists has voiced grave concern over the development of the conflict in the editorial office of the IZVESTIYA newspaper. It was recent cadre appointments which caused the exacerbation of the situation. The new editor-in-chief of Nedelya received his position in accordance with the order of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet though this is within the exclusive competence of the IZVESTIYA editorial board as the only founder of NEDELYA. In exactly the same way, without discussion by the editorial board and without approval of the founder, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the first assistant to the editor-in-chief of IZVESTIYA received his new position. The executive secretariat of the USSR Union of Journalists has appealed to the USSR Supreme Soviet to look into the situation which has developed and to take into account the opinion of the USSR Union of Journalists.

Gorbachev Favors Entrepreneurship Council

LD0207171191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has supported the idea of setting up a Council for Entrepreneurship under the USSR president. This news was reported to journalists today by Vladislavlev, chairman of the executive committee of the USSR Scientific Industrial Union. He said that this should be an effective instrument providing for the transition to a normal market

economy. It is proposed that the council will be comprised of specialists and representatives of organizations which are interested in the development of the entrepreneurship movement. The USSR Scientific Industrial Union will be its coordinator as the main force protecting the rights of entrepreneurs.

Bessmertnykh Sums Up Minsk Chernobyl Conference

PM0207141391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 91 Second Edition p 2

[Report by unidentified PRAVDA correspondent: "World Must Know the Truth. Ministers Discuss Problems of Aid for Chernobyl"]

[Text] Minsk—The participants in the third sitting of the Council of USSR and Union Republic Foreign Ministers in connection with UN activity designed to ease the aftermath of the Chernobyl catastrophe has completed its work in Minsk.

Colleagues from 11 republics, along with observers from Latvia and Estonia, took part in the two plenary sittings chaired by P. Kravchenko, head of the Belorussian Foreign Ministry. What was discussed? Here is the summary given by USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh:

"The main task facing our council here in Minsk is to more clearly coordinate our actions in resolving the problems of Chernobyl. The overall task is supremely clear: to multiply two-fold, three-fold, or 10-fold the efforts to provide international aid for the victims of the catastrophe of the century. The discussion was very specific and objective. We discussed various forms of cooperation to ensure that the steps taken by the international community are effective and successful.

"Chernobyl is not only the affair of the three afflicted republics nor of our Union alone—the whole world is involved in resolving this highly complex problem. Mankind's ability to react to critical situations of this kind on a planetary scale is gauged by how we are able to organize the requisite aid."

The participants in the third sitting of the Council of USSR and Union Republic Foreign Ministers urged the world community to respond to the UN secretary general's appeal, in connection with the fifth anniversary of the accident, to provide generous, long-term aid for the disaster victims. They voiced the hope that September's conference to announce the voluntary donations for these purposes would help create a material, financial, and intellectual foundation for the Chernobyl international cooperation program.

Wage Reform Planned for Maritime Enterprises

LD0107225791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1404 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 1 Jul (TASS)—The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has granted maritime transportation enterprises the right to increase the base rate of consumer funds from June to December of this year by an average of 40 percent. The Cabinet decision notes that this measure has been taken in order to ensure the stable operational function of maritime transportation and to create additional incentives for good work and for increasing personel.

The Ministry of the Maritime Fleet, together with the Council of the Federal Independent Trade Union of Workers in Water Transportation, has been instructed to work our recommendations for a differentiated wages system, taking into consideration its complex nature. In 1991 measures are due to be taken to further increase incomes by no less than 270 million rubles by means of expanding the production of consumer goods and of rendering services to the population, and increasing the fleet's carrying capacity and the intensive nature of loading and unloading operations. The funds obtained should be directed toward covering planned expenditure.

The Cabinet of Ministers deems it necessary to begin wage reform in maritime transportation next year.

Interethnic 'Rapid Deployment Unit' Established

LD0207141391 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—The Soviet Prosecutor's Office has set up a special rapid deployment unit to tackle ethnic conflicts.

The unit will employ qualified volunteers who would be able to stay long periods of time in ethnic hot spots, Aleksandr Frolov, chief of the new unit, told TASS.

The creation of the new force could prompt other bodies to set up similar units, Frolov said.

KGB Uncovers Art Treasures, Antiques

OW0307091091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On June 11, in the Central Russian city of Penza, the special crime squad, working in cooperation with the local KGB detained the director of a local photo studio who was found in possession of a number of valuable art treasures and antiques. The haul included a Guarneri violin and a painting thought to have been taken from the Dresden Art Gallery during World War Two, 8 original ikons and 97 antique books. The detainee was also found to be in possession of car parts worth more than 50 thousand rubles.

Poll Shows Concern for Health, Food Budget

OW0307055191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 2 Jul 91

["Viewpoint" report; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The news agency DATA reports the findings of an opinion poll carried out by the National Public Opinion Studies Center (VCIOM) in May and June among 1,255 people making up a representative cross-section of Russia's population. The respondents were invited to give no more than three answers to the question "What would you wish to your children and grandchildren?"

Seventy-eight percent said they would wish them good health.

Fifty-two percent would like their children and grandchildren to be happy.

Forty-four percent would like to see them grow up decent people.

Forty percent of those polled attached considereable significance to their children's material welfare.

Among the less frequently mentioned wishes were the following:

—to get a respectable profession (17%);

—to make a good career (7%);

—to be active in life (5%);

—to become famous (1%).

Two percent of the respondents failed to express a definite opinion.

The statistical error margin was set at 3 percent.

The same poll contained a question about the share of family budget spent on food.

Forty percent of the people polled said they spent more than on half of their income on food products.

Twenty-eight percent said food consumed nearly all of their family budget.

Twenty-one percent said it was roughly one half of the money they earned that went on food stores.

Six percent admitted they spent less than 50% of their incomes on food.

Five percent said "I don't know."

The error margin was at 3 percent.

Proponent of Limited Nuclear War Ridiculed

PM0307103891 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 91 Union Edition p 8

[Commentary by A. Ostalskiy: "'Not Obligatory To Destroy Moscow and New York.' Atomic Bomb Advocate Goes on the Offensive"]

[Text] Why do politicians spend so much time and effort on complex talks, why do experts develop arms limitation and monitoring concepts, and why does the public get obsessed with some sort of detente and "new thinking"? What is the point of all this fuss when, as can be ascertained from primary sources, nuclear war is not such a bad thing and need not be feared too much.

Evidently these are the conclusions a reader is supposed to reach after reading an interview in the USSR Union of Writers newspaper DEN [The Day] (No. 12) with "one of the most secret people" in our country, who has been studying the development and construction of nuclear weapons for 32 years—that is how the newspaper introduces him. In this interview V.Z. Nechay, Lenin Prize and State Prize laureate and director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Technical Physics, criticizes the policy of "unilateral concessions" to the West (which is how, in his opinion, the Americans understand "new political thinking") and refutes a "30-year-old delusion"—the concept of the atomic bomb as a weapon of mass destruction. "In actual fact nuclear weapons are primarily designed (and secondarily?!—A.O.) to destroy military targets," he states. And further: "There is no need whatever to destroy New York or Moscow. To begin with (and afterward?—A.O.) strikes will be made on launch silos, military bases, and command centers."

By all accounts we are talking about the concept of a so-called "limited nuclear war," with which certain Western strategists were at one time obsessed and which our journalists so convincingly debunked. This doctrine is, of course, very convenient for drumming up additional weapons appropriations and for calming the public, but it does not withstand any criticism from the common sense viewpoint. Why should we assume that, being under threat of extinction, this or that state will suddenly humanely refrain from utilizing all the nuclear potential at its disposal and will not start using megaton bombs which can wipe cities of millions of people from the face of the Earth? Moreover, all this has at best a theoretical point only in the case of a sudden, preemptive strike being launched. Only then would it be possible to cherish any hope that the destruction of launch silos and command centers could "disarm" the enemy and save us from a retaliatory strike and a nuclear Armageddon... So then, maybe we really will lull the Americans with talks about "new political thinking" and transition to the market, while we ourselves one quiet night... wham!

But all the same, what can be done against the effects of even a limited nuclear war?—after all, many scientists think that the Earth would not survive even that. Nechay does not believe these warnings—and urges us not to believe them. "If we can get by with 100 detonations... nothing particularly terrible will happen.... I believe that our homegrown ecologists have caused more harm to people's health than all the nuclear tests carried out in the country put together."

I admit that until now I have taken a rather skeptical view of efforts to depict the "captains" of our military-industrial complex as such crackpots—like the amoral villains brought to life in the characters of S. Kubrick's

well-known film satire "Dr. Strangelove, or How I Stopped Worrying and Learned To Love the Bomb." People did not believe that it could be these very people, involved in high military policy, who would so threaten perestroyka and democratization in our country. But when figures who are fully conversant with our economy's catastrophic situation demand the maintenance of or else an increase in expenditure on "instruments of death," it becomes really terrifying.

Surely Nechay doesn't really believe that the very "weakening of the country's military potential will inevitably bring in its wake a decline in the economy and the degradation of science and industry"? But we innocents were supposing that all these terrors were already happening before our eyes—and primarily because of inordinate and unprecedented expenditure on the "military machine" which is literally gobbling up the country.

...But it is nevertheless comforting that at least New York and Moscow do not necessarily have to be destroyed. Somehow that just makes you glad and lifts the spirit.

TASS Reviews Press for 3 July

LD0307063891 Moscow TASS in English 0617 GMT 3 Jul 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS—Participants in a meeting in the Kremlin on Tuesday, chaired by President Mikhail Gorbachev, discussed economic results of the past six months and the economic forecast for the second half of the year, newspapers report.

The London meeting, where the USSR president has for the first time in history been invited for talks with leaders of the seven leading industrialized states, "will undoubtedly become a major event in world politics," PRAVDA writes.

On June 28, Mikhail Gorbachev who is general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party presided over a meeting of a commission working on a new party programme.

The meeting discussed a draft programme prepared by the commission's working group.

PRAVDA publishes Gorbachev's opening and closing remarks at the meeting.

PRAVDA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, TRUD and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA report that prominent state figures proposed setting up a broad movement for democratic reforms. Organisers, including Arkadiy Volskiy, Nikolayi Petrakov, Gavriil Popov, Aleksandr Rutskoy, Anatoliy Sobchak, Ivan Silayev, Stanislav Shatalin, Eduard Shevardnadze and Aleksandr Yakovlev, issued an address to Soviet citizens. Newspapers carry extracts from the statement.

President Carlos Salinas de Gortari of Mexico arrives on an official visit to Moscow today. PRAVDA publishes the president's biography and a photograph. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carries several stories about Carlos Salinas de Gortari and Mexico.

PRAVDA carries Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao's telegrams to Mikhail Gorbachev and Valentin Pavlov, in which he thanked the Soviet leaders for congratulating him on his election as prime minister and his 70th birthday.

Newspapers publish the new draft Union treaty. President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan and President Kakhar Makhkamov of Tajikistan comments in PRAVDA on the document.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries an interview with President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan.

The second congress of the Movement for the Communist Initiative was held in Moscow on June 29 and 30, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reports. Professor Aleksey Sergeyev, a member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, comments on the forum's results.

The newspaper reports that its article about the position of former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze published on June 15 drew a wide public response both in the Soviet Union and abroad. The newspaper carries comments on the article.

The Council of the Soviet Confederation of Trade Unions criticised the Soviet cabinet for its failure to meet several provisions of a bilateral agreement on labour and social-economic issues for 1991, according to TRUD.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN carries an interview with Aleksey Salmin, head of a department of the Soviet Institute of Workers' Movement and comparative politology.

An international conference which discussed the aftermath of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, ended in Vienna recently. Georgiy Gotovchits, chairman of the Ukrainian committee for the protection of the population from the effects of the accident, who took part in the conference, protested over a conclusion by "specialists independent from IAEA" that the effects of the accidents were not that dangerous. Gotovchits comments [on] the forum's results in TRUD.

The newspaper carries an interview with Igor Zaslavskiy, director of the Moscow Employment Exchange Employment Centre, who said that "unemployment is becoming a permanent factor on the labour market."

Milk purchases fell by four million tonnes in January-July, compared to the same period last year, SELSKAYA ZHIZN reports.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes about a special search and rescue unit—a unique structure of the air forces,

without which not a single space flight can be carried out, according to the newspaper.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA informs about a new opposition organisation—the forum for Lithuania's future.

In their international sections, newspapers comment on developments in Yugoslavia. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes congratulations by the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the beginning of a liberation war by the Yugoslav people against Nazi invaders.

PRAVDA comments on the disbandment of the Council for Mutual Economic Achievements [as received]. It also carries an interview with Swiss President Flavio Kotti.

Economic

Interrepublican Economic Commission Meets

LD3006075191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A routine session of the interrepublican economic commission for monitoring the fulfillment of economic agreements between the USSR and the republics took place in Moscow today.

[Begin reporter V. Stepanyuk recording] It is significant that the atmosphere was businesslike and calm in which the commission, which includes republican deputy heads of government, was today discussing a complex and controversial issue such as material and technical supplies for the country's national economy next year. Some republics signed the draft agreement immediately. Others have, for the time being, voiced criticisms and proposals. Overall, both Vitaliy Khusseynovich Doguzhiyev, the country's vice president [as heard], who chairs the commission, and all the parties to the discussion are convinced that agreement will eventually be reached. Reality will force us to observe common sense. Looking to the immediate future, economic managers are striving to prevent an even worse shortage of fuel, rolled metal, and timber products.

For this reason there was detailed discussion of the problems of pricing policy. At this transitional period, when there is no market yet, it was noted in the commission, a rise in the price of petroleum products and other resources must be prevented from causing fresh distortions in the economy.

The commission today continued its discussion of the stabilization of work in the basic industries of coal and timber, the provision of incentives for the release of agricultural output into state stocks, the fulfillment of the commission's previous decisions, in particular the way in which enterprises recently halted for ecological reasons are resuming operations. It is in this sort of atmosphere that the commission is seeking the most acceptable solutions to the most difficult problems. After each session, a simple truth becomes more and more clear: Our country can only be extricated from its crisis by means of accord. [end recording]

Gorbachev Views Progress, G-7

OW0307044291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1600 GMT 1 Jul 91

["Mikhail Gorbachev Warns Soviet Repblics: 'No One Will Be Able To Break Out of the Crisis Independently'"—INTERFAX headline]

[Text] In Moscow, President Mikhail Gorbachev has held a conference with the prime ministers and government officials of the 15 Soviet republics. The parties discussed the country's social- economic performance in the first half, and the prospects for the second half of the year.

In his closing speech Mr. Gorbachev said that those numerous officials of various ranks "who have claimed the role of radical supporters of revolutionary reforms in the economy," should be ready to take on the responsibility for the tough measures to stabilize the finances and establish stringent control over prices, credits, wage increases and everything else having to do with production boosting. He said the expediency of such measures was recognized by foreign experts, too: the international centers that helped Grigoriy Yavlinskiy write his economic program attached priority significance to having the USSR slash its military spending, and raise credit interest rates to a level of 20-30 percent with a view to stabilizing the ruble. But when it came to putting these measures into practice, the proponents of "superrevolutionary change" were reluctant to shoulder the repsonsibility for it, the president said.

"In real life," he continued, "barter trade has been gaining momentum, local custom checkpoints have been set up in many places, wages have been creeping up, and taxes shrinking. That is anything but a serious policy. We should learn one simple truth: no one of us will break out of the economic crisis independently."

Describing his outlook for attending the G-7 conference in London, M. Gorbachev warned that "no one will agree to cooperate with us as long as our economy and finances are as unstable as now." He suggested focusing on "three major problems facing the country today"; 1) avoiding a repetition of past mistakes and making full use of the autumn harvest; 2) duly preparing for the coming winter ("If we are warm and have enough food we'll be able to survive and carry on with our reforms"); and 3) adjusting the finances through taking a set of coordinated measures. "Unless we've accomplished all these tasks, no anti-crisis program will ever work," Gorbachev concluded.

'Everything Hinges on Accord'

LD0207193391 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev told an economic meeting in the Kremlin today that although the country "shows signs of stabilisation, the question today is that of survival".

"The economy ties us all together very tightly. It dictates that not one of us can pull out of the crisis on his own. We should take a concerted action," Gorbachev said. "No one in the world will deal with us, unless we reach an accord in society, improve the economy and finances".

Food is the major problem, Gorbachev continued. The current task is to bring in the harvest without losses, to put all food enterprises on stream. Having noted that leaders of all republics must establish control over this, Gorbachev called for tight centralisation in this sphere, which is characteristic for many prosperous economies.

Gorbachev noted that participants in today's meeting had failed to agree on ways to revive finances. "In the meantime, the anti-crisis programme is a soap bubble without an agreement on this issue. It is senseless to speak about the market in this case."

Having urged the fulfilment of agreements, Gorbachev stressed that "otherwise, strict control over the entire banking system should be imposed. I personally do not support this."

"We can and must preserve our market, the common economic space, which the entire world wants us to do," the Soviet president said.

"The true resolve is not to take hasty steps but to act in a single system. I am for actions in the spirit of the treaty of Union, for expanding the potential of republics. Without the genuine freedom of commodity producer, there can be no genuine market. A complex of ownership issues should be solved as soon as possible."

"As a result, everything hinges on accord, consequently on the treaty of the Union. We have shed a lot of sweat and blood in order to work out common attitudes, to reach compromise. If anybody begins to wreck it, no matter from which side, we should rise as one to defend the attained unity. This is our common chance of survival," Gorbachev stressed.

Pavlov on 'Grave' Situation

LD0207192391 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov told an economic meeting hosted by the Soviet president today that the crisis had been checked in May-June.

Pavlov said that rates of production slump slowed down. Commodity stocks began to increase. However the situation in the national economy remains grave, even dangerous. In industry production of four fifths of all types of products went down, failure to meet supply obligations becomes widespread, food stocks decreased to dangerous level and there is an acute shortage of goods in state trade. Slump is especially painful in construction.

"All this is not the result of natural calamity but a logic process, the consequence of our former economic policy," he continued. "We were late in changing the course and are late with reforms now."

Speaking about prospects for the remaining six months, Pavlov said that while planning to significantly boost imports, the government hopes to achieve a certain revival in the economy. As a result the country will be able to reach the 1990 level in terms of average statistical production.

Pavlov described harvest as the key problem. He emphasised that all possible measures should be taken to avoid last year's losses. "At the world market, prices on farm produce are rising. They are already waiting for us. We must not regularly spend foreign currency on grain."

Having noted that the financial situation remains acute, Pavlov said that it was primarily the result of failure to observe economic agreements between the centre and republics.

Having opposed the curtailment of social programmes, Pavlov pointed to the need to build up production. "We're past the most difficult stage of price-formation," he assured. "Next in turn is price liberalisation, i.e. transition to the market."

More on Pavlov Comments

OW0307043591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Transmitted by KYODO]

[Text] On Tuesday in the Kremlin a meeting begun between the Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and representatives of the governments of all fifteen republics. The meeting is dedicated to the results of the social and economic development of the first six months of this year and to forecasts regarding the remaining six. In a speech given at the meeting the Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. Valentin Pavlov said amongst other things that the country's budget deficit amounted to 4.2 billion hard rubles. This can only be covered by taking out new loans. In this way the foreign debt of the country could reach 44 billion hard rubles by the end of the year, rather than the 39 billion forecast previously. According to Mr. Pavlov, the country is dependent on receiving foreign credits in order to cancel former debts.

The premier also anounced that in May and June the tempo of slow- down in the economy was halted,

although the general picture remains as before. The volume of production is 6 percent lower than for the same period last year. Particuclar concern is being caused by the fall in the production of consumer goods and food as well as by the recession in the construction industry.

Mr. Pavlov remarked that the internal budget deficit for the first six months of the year amounted to 58 billion rubles, and if the fall in production continues, then the deficit could rise to 250 billion rubles by the end of the year.

The estimated grain harvest is set at 180-190 million tonnes. Thus it will still be necessary to buy 77 million tonnes of grain from abroad.

The participants of the meeting include the heads of government of the nine republics who have expressed their willingness to sign the union treaty; among them the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan are represented by presidents and premiers.

From those republics which are refusing to sign the union treaty Armenia is represented by the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, Mr. L. Ter-Petrosyan, Latvia by the Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis, Lithuania by the deputy economics minister Mr. Novitskas and Estonia by the economics Minister Mr. Leimon. Moldovia's delegate is the Prime Minister Valeriy Muravskiy and Georgia's is Prime Minister Tengiz Sigua.

Republican Leaders Remark

LD0207195591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Video report by correspondents S. Suntsov, A. Gromov, and A. Gromov, and A. Ivanov, not individually identified, including recorded remarks by V.P. Fokin, Ukrainian prime minister; M.Sh. Shaymiyev, Tatar president; and I.T. Godmanis, chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers; at an economic conference in Moscow on 2 July; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We begin our program with a reportage from the Kremlin. An economic conference took place there today, under the chairmanship of USSR President Gorbachev, with the participation of leaders of republics, ministries, and departments.

[Correspondent] There was discussion of the results of economic development in the first half year and the prospects for the national economy to the end of the year. Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov, prime minister, noted that volumes of production had decreased by almost six percent. However, in May-June success was achieved in halting the crisis, which intensified at the start of the year due to the disruption of economic links between republics, and strikes. One of the chief tasks today, the report noted, is to stabilize the provision of foodstuffs, to preserve and process all the harvest. Among the alarming symptoms is additional spending by the republics on their programs; this sum already amounts to 45 billion rubles. The competition to see who can increase their wages most, and reduce their hours quickest, can only intensify the crisis phenomena. In their turn the republics' representatives also expressed criticism of the Cabinet of Ministers.

Here are a few interviews taken during an interval in the conference. Do you think that in the near future success will be achieved in stabilizing the foodstuffs market in the country?

[Fokin] You know that in the report delivered by Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov, and in the replies by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, there were reproaches and criticisms directed at the government of the Ukraine for a number of emergency measures. The republican parliament supported the government of the Ukraine, and adopted a decision on introducing subsidies for the purchase of grain and other agricultural produce. For the problem is an extremely acute one, and the point is that parity has been violated between prices for industrial products and prices for agricultural products. This has led to three quarters the farms suffering, either making low profits or losses. And now, when the fate of the harvest dictates that we must go in for the most extreme measures to ensure that grain gets into the stores and to ensure the procurement of foodstuffs, I think that this step is justified. If we manage to do this, and I think that we will achieve this, I believe that there will not be any great difficulties with foodstuffs, either in the Ukraine or in the country as a whole.

[Shaymiyev] We consider that under conditions of transferring to the market, enterprises should be free in any economic space. We are striving to strengthen the Union. We are striving for economic autonomy to ensure that the economic potential possessed by the Republics, created over all of these years, will allow us, by means of better use and more autonomous work, to improve the lives of the population of our Republic. We are sure of this.

[Godmanis] Of course, we greatly support the emphasis that was laid on interrepublican treaties, as we consider that precisely by reaching agreement between republics on purely economic matters, it is possible to put economic relations on a new level. I, personally, have brought with me an extensive letter from the government of Latvia, that I wish to hand to Ivan Sergeyevich Pavlov and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, about those proposals on how we propose to construct relations, purely economic relations—banking and financial, and on questions of property and, say, joint programs of financing. Our most important governmental task is to improve and develop economic links.

[Announcer] In the afternoon there were sharp debates at the conference. The speeches revealed differences in approaches by various republics to implementing the jointly elaborated documents. But all the same, the

thought that it is essential to overcome the contradictions which threaten to push the country into the abyss seems to be shared by everyone now.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev summed up the results of the discussion. He stressed that now everything now comes down to accord, and that means the Union treaty.

'Contradictions' Mark Conference

LD0207175391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] In Moscow today, a conference of leaders of Union and autonomous republics took place under the chairmanship of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. At it there was discussion of the economic situation in the country. Valeriy Kiosa, our correspondent, will supply the details.

[Kiosa] First of all, what the conference was devoted to. It was devoted to analyzing the socioeconomic development of the country in the first half of this year, and a forecast of how we will finish this year. The importance of this theme goes without saying, and the fact that it really is important for everyone is confirmed by looking at those who were present at this conference—not only those republics which have signed the nine plus one agreement, but also those who were not parties to this agreement. In particular, Georgia was represented by the chairman of the government, Latvia by the prime minister, Armenia by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. In my view, this once again shows that economic interdependence in our state is very great.

Valentin Pavlov, the country's prime minister, delivered a report. He stressed that the situation in the country now is very serious, and the question is now really about the survival of the state. The fall in production in industry in the first half year was six percent; the national income fell by 11 percent. In the second half-year the falling trend in production will continue; but the question is to what extent.

The government considers that there are three variants for the development of events. If everything remains as it is now, then the standard of living by the end of the year should fall by 12-15 percent and the national income by 20 percent. If a pure market mechanism is introduced immediately, without any preparation, the fall in national income will be up to 30 percent, and then the country will simply collapse. If the anti-crisis program is implemented it is possible to reduce this fall to 70 percent. That is, in the opinion of the prime minister, if this program is implemented a certain degree of stabilization in our economy is possible.

This optimism, I must say, was not shared by the leaders of the republics who spoke today at the conference. In particular, President Karimov of Uzbekistan said that in his opinion we are now going at full speed toward a third variant—that is, toward chaos. The most fundamental question for him is the implementation of the economic agreements signed by the republics for this year, and all the more so the implementation of the anti-crisis program for 1992. Karamanov, prime minister of Kazakhstan, spoke in a very similar spirit. He stated that the accords should not at all remain just on paper. The nine plus one agreement has been achieved; the joint economic program has been achieved. The Union treaty remains to be signed; however, now there are clear attempts to delay the signing of this most important document.

But what I must call attention to is the contradictions between the republics themselves, and between the republics and the center—lack of accord in actions and even in utterances. Contradictions could be observed today even in one and the same speeches. In particular, the leader of the Belorussian Government insisted on the complete economic autonomy of the republic, and at the same time he considered that it was necessary to give emergency powers to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. The question arises: For what?

It was precisely the lack of accord in actions to which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the country's president, called attention in his summing up. He stressed that no one will succeed in getting out of the deep crisis on their own, and that we are now at the stage where the question really arises—and I repeat this once again—of the survival of the country. Moreover, on the eve of the meeting of the seven, the country's president said that no one will have any dealings with us if there is no stability in society and the economy. No one will come in to our collapsed economy, even after the political decision is made on help for the Soviet Union.

Therefore, the main question was the question of accord. At the same time the country's president did not rule out taking the most decisive and harsh measures to resolve the following main tasks in the second half of this year. First of all, these are foodstuffs—that is, bringing in the harvest, preserving and processing it. Second, the fuel and power complex; this should have centralized control, or otherwise there would be no heat or light.

The greatest alarm is caused by finances where the republics' greatest lack of accord is to be observed. Here, the president said that he had the power to take under his control all the banking system of the country, but he was categorically against this, and proposed once again that agreement should be reached on all financial questions. As far as the anti-crisis program is concerned, the decision of the president is unambiguous—the program should be implemented without delay.

Reasons for Higher Customs Scales Questioned

LD2606134891 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 24 Jun 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The "Vesti" program now continues its investigations into the new customs rules. The BBC thinks that

they don't bode us anything well, and are essentially a purely fiscal measure, the simplest way of filling the treasury coffers, while blocking the channels by which the stocks of the commercial shops are replenished will once again drain the lifeblood of trade. Here is the opinion of Sergey Rybin:

[Rybin] So the quesion arises: Doesn't the raising of customs duty rates run counter to the current economic situation in the country, when we have shortages of literally everything? The customs authorities, and consequently the Council of Ministers as the initiator, reply with confidence:

[Chmel—identified from screen caption—deputy head of the customs service] There aren't any contradictions here. We have approved these laws and a whole range of other rules with our colleagues, say, in developed countries. But our economic situation is somewhat diferent. Direct parallels are not appropriate here, therefore.

[Rybin] No matter how much one may want to, it is impossible to detect any logic in this tightrope walking with words. Whereas it's all very simple if you stand on your feet and not on your head. In the West they have high rates of duty, not because they don't have the goods, but because there are surpluses of everything and they are therefore compelled to use high rates of duty to protect their own producers. What then will be the result of raising duty rates for us?

[Rybin] What will happen to prices in the commercial shop?

[Unidentified interviewee] Prices will automatically increase in the commercial shops by the amount that the customs raise their rates.

[Rybin] This man is a legal Soviet businessman, but he didn't want to show his face because unlike the state racketeers, he cannot rely on the protection either of the KGB or the militia.

[Interviewee] What specifically motivated them as to why this should be 50, and that should be 3,000 or 2,000? [figures only as heard] There's no need to regulate the market. The market is itself the regulator of everything. Good intentions are not needed. The struggle against speculation—people are getting rich on this. There's nothing wrong in that. The money they earn is spent on the internal market. The thing to do is to saturate the market.

[Rybin] Today, incidentally, is a very curious date: on 24 June 1891, protective customs duties on goods were introduced in tsarist Russia—the economic situation then was much better than the one we have now. How long are we going to go on living the wrong way? Sergey Rybin, "Vesti."

Uzbek President Views Economic Situation

LD0307091491

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian at 1730 GMT on 2 July carried a five-minute recording of an interview with Uzbek President Islam Abduganiyevich Karimov by Valeriy Kiosa.

Karimov, who took part in the 2 July Moscow meeting of union and autonomous republican leaders on the economic situation, chaired by President Gorbachev, said that of three forecasts by the Ministry of Economy the third is the most likely if one takes all current tendencies into account. This forecast predicts a 30 percent fall in production by the end of the year and the deterioration of the consumer market. He added that bitterness and dissatisfaction are on the increase and people are starting to wonder why the problems are clearly perceived but nothing is being done about it.

Karimov said that republican leaders must "set up at least some element of power, to show and prove to themselves and to people generally that they have some substance." Otherwise, they should all resign, he argued. Economic incentives and interest will develop in the country when the market system is fully established in the country and people's awareness has been restructured, he said. Until then, if necessary, power should be used in the transitional period, and discipline is essential. Those whose duty it is to exercise power are unwilling to take the responsibility. It is important to use power within the framework of agreements that have been made, and to demand that those who sign a document or program follow it, he says. The country is only one step away from anarchy and it is only the rule of law that can prevent this, he declared. Existing laws must be observed, he stated.

Funds Allocated for Krasnodar Cardiology Center

PM0207080291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "In the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers"]

[Text] In order to ensure timely payments to foreign firms involved in the construction and technical fitting out of the cardiological center in Krasnodar, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has in 1991 allotted a targeted grant of 20 million rubles in freely convertible currency (at the USSR State Bank official rate) to Krasnodar Kray Soviet Executive Committee, out of union-republic currency fund current revenue earmarked in accordance with the decision of the union-republic currency committee for priority payments for the agro-industrial complex.

USSR State Bank Official on Finance Issues

LD3006093591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0130 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Vyacheslav Sergeyevich Zakharov, deputy chairman of board of USSR State Bank, interviewed by Sergey Omelchenko; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Zakharov] You know, there is a certain contradiction between the interests of commercial banks and enterprises. Of course, commercial banks are only too happy to charge the highest possible interest rates for their credits and thus to gain more profit. However, on the other hand, entrepreneurs are not interested in it. And here, I think, the State Bank should play the role of a kind of an arbitrator. At the first stage—and I emphasize it—of the establishment of market relations, it should restrict, in some ways, the appetites of commercial banks. [passage omitted]

The State Bank is intending, at least during the current year—I do not know what is going to happen in the future—to impose regulations on interests rates for credits given by commercial banks.

Much more money is currently in circulation, than is actually required; everybody recognizes this. Therefore, the State Bank, as a champion of the state's interests, is interested in withdrawing this money from circulation, in some way, or at least, not allowing a further money emission. [passage omitted]

You see, the most important thing is to be able to buy goods. However, starting from the beginning of this year, the amount of left-over money on the accounts of enterprises has grown by more than 40 billion; on individual accounts of the population—by almost 40 billion. This means, they could not buy goods. There are simply no goods in the market. [passage omitted]

In order to implement a gentle, humane money withdrawal, the USSR Ministry of Finance tried, last year, to sell securities or bonds. Considering that the total amount of left-over money owned by enterprises amounts to 172 billion rubles [R] at the moment, such method of tying it up could be very useful for our economy. [passage omitted] Unfortunately, this did not quite work because a large number of bonds—R40billion worth of them—were purchased by you: the USSR State Bank.

[Zakharov] Yes, we purchased R49 billion worth of them, and we hoped that the Ministry of Finance would use its unfortunate experience to improve upon it this year, that is, establish more favorable interest rates—higher ones, perhaps, introduce shorter credit terms. However, this did not happen. In fact, no bonds were issued by the Ministry of Finance this year.

[Omelchenko] What way out do you see of the current financial situation? Because it is finance, is it not, that determines the health of our economy? A reform based on weak curency, is doomed.

[Zakharov] Any economic reform must be based on hard money only. The money must be strengthened, and only through economic measures, inluding a balance between economy and finance. Withdrawal of surplus money, and I should like to stress it, not confiscation, but using civilized methods which have been repeatedly applied in the whole world.

USSR Law on Economic Arbitration

914A0820A

For the USSR Law on Economic Arbitration published in the 6 June 1991 IZVESTIYA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-029, dated 28 June 1991, pages 18-34.

USSR Law on Protection of Consumer Rights

914D0218A

For the USSR Law on Protection of Consumer Rights published in the 10 June 1991 IZVESTIYA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-029, dated 28 June 1991, pages 51-58.

USSR Law on Resolution of Labor Disputes

914F0222A

For the Law on Resolution of Labor Disputes published in the 17 May 1991 TRUD, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-029, dated 28 June 1991, pages 94-98.

Tula Small Arms Factory in Begins Conversion

OW0107234391 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1900 GMT 22 Jun 91

[A. Bogoslavskaya video report on the Tula arms plant; from the "Radar-TV" program]

[Excerpts] [Bogoslavskaya] This monument to the great reformer of Russia can be, to some extent, considered a business card of Tula, since it is located right in front of the entrance to the famous Tula Small Arms Plant—a fact which, until recently, was not freely acknowledged. [Video shows statue of Peter the Great outside factory building, then cuts to assembly workers on the shop floor] Nowadays, many unreasonable and sometimes ridiculous prohibitions have been lifted. Think for yourselves: Was it really a secret to anyone that the Tula Small Arms Plant was still manufacturing combat and sporting arms, as it did 70, 100, and even 170 years ago.

[Video shows sign saying "Armorer! Be vigilant. You are working for the strengthening of the defense capability of the Motherland. Do not allow cases of loss or theft of arms"; then cuts to worker demonstrating a weapon, workers assembling it]

Here we have an AKMS Kalashnikov shortened submachine gun, which is available for interior, airborne, and border troops, and is rightfully considered the most reliable weapon in the world, to quote Tula residents. Our film crew was the first in many years to be allowed into the holy of holies—the submachine gun assembly shop. You are watching a truly unique film. [Video cuts to interview with V. A. Scherbinin, Tula Small Arms Plant shop chief]

Have you been working in this shop for long?

[Scherbinin] Yes, I have been 10 years now in this shop.

[Bogoslavskaya] Then you must have been really young when you arrived here to take charge.

[Scherbinin] Yes, of course, after the Polytechnical Institute.

[Bogoslavskaya] So, it means that armorers trust young people?

[Scherbinin] Yes, in our factory, people are trusted more.

[Bogoslavskaya] I have seen quite a few women working in the shop.

[Scherbinin) Yes, 60 percent of those working in the shop are women.

[Bogoslavskaya] Seems such an unfeminine occupation.

[Scherbinin] Well, we have many feminine occupations here: varnishers, sorters, female assembly metal workers.

[Bogoslavskaya] Do people in your shop go through some kind of selection? I mean, can just any person come here off the streets?

[Scherbinin] Not any person off the street can work in the shop. Naturally, a selection is made, and people who enter the shop have already been tested.

[Bogoslavskaya] What does that mean?

[Scherbinin] Well, people who have worked in other enterprises naturally have their labor logbooks examined, and job-hoppers do n¬t get sent here. If the person is keen on alcohol, he will not stay in the shop for long.

[Bogoslavskaya] We all read and hear a lot of disturbing information that a great deal of unregistered weapons circulates in the country. What do you think? Can weapons be stolen from your plant and your shop?

[Scherbinin] At each stage of manufacture, the stock is accounted for, from the beginning to the finished product. At any time, we can establish a shortage of product and determine the entire technological cycle the missing item has been through.

[Bogoslavskaya] So you think that...?

[Scherbinin] [interrupting] Yes, at any stage of manufacturing.

[Bogoslavskaya] So, you think that your shop has no connection with the incidents happening in this country nowadays?

[Scherbinin] I think not.

[Bogoslavskaya] Tell me, please, since you have been managing the shop for 10 years—have the Tula armorers lost their reputation as first-class craftsmen armorers during this period?

[Scherbinin] Well, the team almost completely renewed itself over 10 years, and the old personnel who had worked here 10 years ago naturally transferred all their knowledge to the young. In all the time I have been working here, we never had our products returned by consumers.

[Bogoslavskaya] So much for quality. What about quantity, what about the effects conversion had on Tula armorers?

[Scherbinin] Yes, orders dropped by approximately one third.

[Bogoslavskaya] What will you do?

[Scherbinim] Meanwhile we have already produced the first commercial batch —admittedly, a small one—of Item (TOF78), which is a hunting carbine. So, a full conversion of production is expected in the shop quite soon. The weapons will be kept in warehouses, since they can be useful only in times which are not peaceful. Today, we probably should develop consumer goods.

[Bogoslavskaya] Those are the prospects opening before the Tula Small Arms Plant today. Our filming here was dictated, not only by a desire to be the first to penetrate the veil of secrecy and to capture on film the manufacture of what are still combat arms. Today's armorers are heirs to the outstanding masters of the past, perpetuators of age-old traditions. [passage omitted] [Video shows Bogoslavskaya interviewing M. T. Kalashnikov, chief small arms engineer] Do you consider Sergey Ivanovich Mosin your own teacher, in a way?

[Kalashnikov] I think there is a direct connection between us, since the history of Russian small arms starts with Mosin, and I am his successor.

[Bogoslavskaya] What do you think? Will the time come when the profession of military weapons engineer will no longer be needed?

[Kalashnikov] I would like such a time to come, but I think this is unlikely in the forseeable future. One must not forget, I have been making weapons, not for war but for peace, for the defense of the borders of our Fatherland.

Agricultural

Impact of Weather on Farming Areas Viewed

PM0207105391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Second Edition p 1

[A. Klimenko report under the rubric "Peasants' Concerns": "Drought Is No Joke"]

[Text] Our view of the harvest has been undergoing a strange change. In the spring people were predicting a bumper harvest. A little later the forecast was for a good harvest. Now, it seems, people are agreed that the harvest will be average. I phoned my friends at the Krasnozerskiy Rayon Center in Novosibirsk Oblast.

"We're on fire," was the answer. "In the 40-degree heat the sandy soil of our Kulundinskaya Steppe is just like a brazier. Anyone who lost an hour in the spring will now need more than a year to make it up."

PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Shpakov reports from Omsk:

"'At last!' That exclamation was probably to be heard on the lips of hundreds of thousands of the oblast's residents when the first rains fell on the parched land.

"Of course, some people will say that the only reason things have improved is that the weather partially relented at the end of June. However, there is no doubt that A. Lavrinenko, chief of the oblast agro-industrial complex crop farming food production and processing department, was also right when he stressed: 'The tactics we chose for spring field work have been entirely justified. Every measure was taken to preserve the scanty soil moisture reserves. The sowing was conducted as late as possible. This helped to save the young shoots.'"

I phoned Chelyabinsk. My longstanding friend and fellow-journalist G. Saitov's voice was exultant:

"I just want to shout: I love storms at the end of June! Finally we've had some rain. We'd thought we were done for. The dry spell during the sowing period had gotten us down. But the 'cloudburst' has made us happier and hopeful..."

Unfortunately, we also have to mention the other, negative, sense of the word "storm."

Our correspondent S. Ryabov from Sverdlovsk:

"This is quite literally a hot time for the harvest. This year there have already been over 6,000 fires—60 percent more than in all of 1990. A. Panteleyev, chief of the Sverdlovsk Oblispolkom [Oblast Soviet Executive Committee] Internal Affairs Administration, noted that the fires had done more than 7 million rubles' worth of damage. Fires have destroyed one-third more grain and 44.4 percent more equipment than last year. These losses, Anatoliy Fedorovich believes, would have been far smaller, if the enterprises, institutes, cities, and rayons had not cut back on their fire service."

Yes, a drought is no joke. Fortunately, the grain has been ripening in southern and central regions. And, of course, people can help out those who are in trouble. Most of our people's natural reaction is to rally round and help out. But there have been too many shortcomings this year to lightheartedly wait for food to be put before you on a blue-bordered plate.

Scientific

Cooperation Accord Signed With French Center

LD0207085591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2205 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Report by TASS correspondent Vladimir Shvets]

[Text] Paris, 2 Jul (TASS)—An agreement on cooperation between the French national space research center (CNES), USSR Glavkosmos, and the Splav engineering center in the USSR was signed on Monday evening in the French capital, according to a CNES communique pubished here. The document, which is valid for 10 years, envisages the implementation of joint programs to create new materials in conditions of micro-gravitation. Experiments will be carried out on-board Soviet Foton satellites and also the future Nika-t satellite.

The first experiment, which is to be called Gezon, will be carried out in April 1993. It is to study the influence of permanent magnetic fields on the growth of germanium chrystals in conditions of micro-gravitation. The results of the experiment will be of considerable significance in developing solid-state physics and could find practical application in electronics.

Three 'Big' Nuclear Accidents Before Chernobyl

LD0207152291 Berlin ADN in German 1131 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] Berlin/Moscow (ADN)—Before the reactor catastrophe at Chernobyl in April 1986, there had already been three big nuclear accidents. In an interview with BERLINER KURIER newspaper (Tuesday evening edition), Soviet nuclear expert and chairman of the parliamentary commission for nuclear energy Aleksandr Penyagin said: "The only way to avoid a nuclear holocaust is to stop construction." According to Penyagin, tens of thousands of tonnes of nuclear waste were dumped into the river Techa in the southern Urals after 1945. In this way at least 140,000 people were heavily contaminated. Eight years later a storage container burst at the nuclear fuel factory Mayak.

Penyagin demanded that nuclear research should be separated from the defense industry. The construction of nuclear power plants in the Soviet Union should be

banned for five years. "Nuclear energy must only be generated again here when standards have been improved."

Parameters of 'Gorizont' Satellite Listed

LD0307084191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0759 GMT 3 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 3 Jul (TASS)—In accordance with the development program for the communications and television broadcasting system through the use of artificial earth satellites, another communications satellite "Gorizont" was launched yesterday in the Soviet Union by the "Proton" rocket.

The satellite has been placed in a near-circular orbit with the initial parameters:

—distance from the earth's surface—35,672 km.

—period of orbit round the earth—23 hours 50 minutes.

—orbital inclination—1.4 degrees.

The equipment aboard the "Gorizont" satellite is working normally.

Military

Troop Withdrawal From Szczecin, Poland Reported

LD3006125191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1824 GMT 29 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Galkin]

[Text] Warsaw, 29 June (TASS)—A engineer battalion of the northern group of troops left Szczecin for the USSR today. There are no more Soviet troops in the city now. "We are saying farewell to you as friends, and still like you," M. Talasiewicz, governor of Szczecin, said at the seeing-off ceremony.

The Soviet units have handed over their hospital to the Szczecin health service their hospital, their barracks to the local police, and their depots to the rural bodies of self-government.

Soviet military units and military freight are continuing to return to the USSR, although a treaty on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland has not been signed yet. Colonel General V.P. Dubynin, commander of the northern group of troops, reported that over 1,500 cars carrying military freight had been dispatched to the USSR in the last month alone.

Southern Group of Forces Dissolved on 27 Jun

PM3006184991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[Interview with Army General A. Betekhtin, first deputy commander in chief of Ground Forces, by special correspondent V. Litovkin in Krasnodar; date not given; first paragraph is introduction: "Southern Group of Forces Is No More"]

[Text] The act on dissolving the Southern Group of Forces, which until recently was stationed on the Hungarian Republic's territory, was signed 27 June in Krasnodar in a businesslike and workaday atmosphere. This document concludes the existence of one of our Army's structures. At our correspondent's request Army General A. Betekhtin, first deputy commander in chief of Ground Forces, comments on the event.

[Betekhtin] There is not a single military unit in Hungary now. But the Southern Group of Forces is not just tanks, guns, and aircraft. It is also 165 military installations with a developed infrastructure and 5,732 accommodation, administrative, and technical buildings, of which 3,783 were constructed with USSR Ministry of Defense money and 1,969 were leased from the Hungarian side.

But I could go on and on quoting figures. I will just say that all this was constructed for our people and is worth, according to a joint Soviet-Hungarian valuation, over 53 billion forints or 2.5 billion foreign currency rubles...

[Litovkin] At the Soviet-Hungarian talks in Budapest I also heard another figure—100 billion forints.

[Betekhtin] This is the difference between the basic price and market value of these facilities.

[Litovkin] I can imagine how useful all this would be to the families of our officers and warrant officers on their native country's territory. But what sums have we managed to obtain for what has been left in Hungary?

[Betekhtin] Very little, actually. Questions of selling the Southern Group of Forces real estate are now being discussed by an intergovernmental committee to which our country's Foreign Ministry, Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, and Defense Ministry belong. It has to be borne in mind that the Hungarian side has presented us with substantial claims for damage to the environment in regions where Soviet military units were stationed and at range facilities, tank training areas, and vehicle testing areas...

[Litovkin] Unfortunately, the environment is not the only problem in our mutual relations. There are also divergences regarding other settlements.

[Betekhtin] Yes. Although the methods for mutual settlements for losses incurred were worked out by us and coordinated and signed by a joint Soviet-Hungarian commission, they have been constantly infringed by our partners during the work and are causing unnecessary

disputes and groundless claims. The protocol on the completion of our troop withdrawal from Hungary has still not been signed. I attribute this to a desire to reduce our settlements to the "zero option," which in my view would be unfair and contrary to law.

[Litovkin] Why contrary to law? After all, everything that has been constructed on Hungarian soil belongs to Hungary.

[Betekhtin] That's as may be. But our interests also have to be considered. I have already cited the figure for what construction has cost us. Especially as currently there is an extreme lack of this kind of money for erecting housing for the very same officers' families who have left Hungary. There are no fewer than 13,000 families. Multiply that by three-four people, and you will grasp the huge number of people waiting for elementary human living conditions... After all, they are not guilty of anything.

[Litovkin] So who is guilty?

[Betekhtin] I think our shortsightedness, our naive perception that we would stay on other people's territory forever, and the extremely limited times for withdrawal.

Of course, one can and must understand the Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, and other East European peoples. We must leave. But look, the Americans intend to leave Europe over 10 years. First they are creating the social conditions for this. They value their people, but do we value ours?

Functions of CPSU's New Army Body Described

PM0207113191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Lieutenant General P. Grigoryev, chairman of the USSR Armed Forces CPSU Organization Control Commission, by Colonel G. Barnev; date and place of interview not specified: "Confirming Fairness"]

[Text] [Barnev] When I was preparing for this meeting I familiarized myself with your service record. The Tambov Military Financial School, service in the Transbaykal, Siberia, Turkmenia, Egypt... And suddenly I saw your name in a "radical" publication among CPSU Central Committee personnel transferred into the Armed Forces apparently to strengthen the position of the party apparatus in the Army.

[Grigoryev] I saw that article. Its author dodges and misrepresents facts and tries with all his might to present things as though the Army and Navy party and political cadres are a party elite that has hastily changed into military uniform but does not know the life of the Armed Forces or the problems, needs, or concerns of ordinary people. That is a lie. Yes, I have recently worked in the Central Committee. And I am proud of it. But I have always been a serviceman. And no helping hand has pulled me along through life. Only work, work that I dare to hope I have done well. To make out that I was practically born on Staraya Square is at the very least dishonorable.

[Barnev] Incidentally, Petr Ivanovich, where are your family roots, so to speak?

[Grigoryev] In the Pskov area. Near Gdov there is a small village called Nizovitsy. That is where I come from. That is where my mother, Olga Afanasyevna, and my sister and brother live...

[Barnev] I can imagine what it looks like. And now the main thing. Tell me about the general outlines of the staff, structure, and immediate tasks of the Control Commission. How does it differ from its predecessor—the party commission at the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate?

[Grigoryev] You said at the Main Political Directorate. But the Control Commission is not "at" anything. It is autonomous. If I can put it this way, it serves not any individual political organ but the entire Armed Forces party organization. Forming CPSU organization control commissions is not just an important aspect in the reform of party structures; it is essentially a way of reviving control organs on Leninist principles in the CPSU. Our tasks and functions are laid down in the Provision on the Control Commission, ratified by the All-Army Party Conference. This means monitoring the All-Army Party Committee's implementation of program documents, CPSU Statutes, and congress and conference decisions. It means the observance of democratic principles in the activity of executive party organs. It means the organizational strengthening of party organizations. It means increasing the activeness of communists in the Army and Navy in implementing party policy in the sphere of military building.

The control commission also examines appeals from party organizations and requests from communists that are sent to it, and it adopts measures in cases of red tape, the suppression of criticism, and abuse of official position. It institutes proceedings against communists who violate party discipline, defends the rights, honor, and dignity of communists, examines appeals from communists, and decides questions of party rehabilitation.

Furthermore, the commission is entrusted with monitoring the implementation of the Armed Forces CPSU organization budget and carrying out inspections of the financial-economic activity of the All-Army Party Committee, its publishing organs, and primary party organizations that come directly under it.

That, in brief and in general, is the sphere of the monitoring activity of the Control Commission and the scale of its work.

As for the numerical strength of the Control Commission, we are not keeping any secrets here either. Thirty

five people have been elected to it. It represents all the important Army and Navy party organizations.

When it was being formed, the interests of communists were taken into account on a professional level too. The commission includes commanders, political and party personnel, engineers, lawyers, and other specialists. A plenum elected a nine-member presidium. Two of its members—the chairman and his deputy—are permanent party workers, and seven people jointly discharge the duties of Control Commission members.

Three permanent commissions for the main areas of activity were formed from among the members of the Control Commission and representatives of party organizations.

The apparatus that the party needs for its work is maintained using the resources of the party budget. It is small: one inspector, who is a serviceman; three senior instructors; two auditors; and four technical workers, all of whom are serving in the Soviet Army.

We determined our top-priority tasks at previous presidium sittings. They are primarily organizational. We need to conclude the building of the whole structure. And we need to assist the control commission chairmen at all levels to do this.

In the course of its work, the presidium has also examined a couple of dozen appeals from communists and party rehabilitation cases. In the near future we are intending to check on the implementation of All-Army Party Conference decisions by the relevant All-Army Party Committee departments and also by the party committees and control commissions of one of the military district party organizations.

[Barnev] Today the CPSU and even the communist idea itself are being subjected to attacks from political opponents and sometimes malicious and unjustified reproaches, and a large number of political hypocrites have emerged. In such a situation it is particularly important to feel the presence of your comrade standing next to you in the party and be sure of his reliability as a human being. How would you determine the essence of the party spirit? What features would you attribute to a person whom you would consider a true communist?

[Grigoryev] The essence of party spirit is laid down in the CPSU Statutes. You have to recognize the Program and carry out the Statutes. The qualities of a communist that impress me include deep conviction and loyalty to the party cause and one's own vital choice, honesty, decency, a highly developed feeling of party comradeship, and activeness. These qualities are always very important, but their importance is multiplied during troubled times.

Meanwhile you cannot fail to see that disorder, vacillation, and inadequate theoretical work on various kinds of transformations have caused turmoil and uncertainty among some communists. Under pressure from circumstances, some are even leaving the party. At the moment I am not talking about those who do so for reasons of opportunism. To people who have parted company with their party membership cards only because the political struggle has become more acute, or because it has now become dangerous to be a communist, or who believe that the party "failed to give them" something—good riddance, as they say. Your heart bleeds for the decent and honest people who have gotten lost along the way. We will fight for those comrades. I see only one path here: Involving them in active work. And for that we must renew the atmosphere in the party collectives. It must be democratic and enable people to blossom as individuals and perceive their value in the collective.

Clearly, you cannot form such an atmosphere with one single measure. As we know, democracy cannot be introduced by order. You need a whole system of measures and painstaking daily work. And I see the task of the control commissions in this sphere as opposing red tape and bureaucratic administration in party work in every way. I believe that the style of the party committees' work should be humane. And we will confirm this policy constantly and consistently and display character and will.

[Garnev] What alarms you as a communist and as leader of the Armed Forces CPSU organization Control Commission most of all in our Army party home?

[Grigoryev] I already broached one problem when I spoke about the essence of party spirit. I can also add that I am worried, as is the commission, about the low energy of some of our primary party organizations, the inertia of communists, and the occasional peculiar understanding of primary party organizations' autonomy, when people think: I will do what I want, but best of all, I will not do anything at all; I will only worry about making sure that the secretary keeps 50 percent of the membership dues, and I will dispose of them as I see fit.

It is also alarming that party organizations in some places are behaving in a passive way, failing to exert a positive influence on solving the tasks that face units and subunits and only involved in their internal affairs. Such an attitude will really make a party organization useless if it is left unchanged. A party organization cannot be apathetic and must not fail to influence the state of affairs in the troops and fleets with its characteristic forms of work.

Unfortunately, the newly formed party committees and control commissions are not yet doing much to activate primary party organizations and all communists in solving the tasks of defense readiness and strengthening military discipline. That is what we believe on the basis of available information from the localities and the results of the first checks.

The fact that in some places strictness is decreasing with respect to communists who do not fulfill the requirements of the CPSU Statutes, grossly violate party discipline, abuse their official position, and commit other improper actions is very alarming. Certain party organizations no longer take any interest when individual communists, particularly among leaders of various ranks, fail to cope with the duties entrusted to them, allow serious shortcomings to occur in their work, and behave in an unworthy way. Some of our party organizations justify their feebleness in this respect by saying that cadre work is not within their sphere of authority. Yes, party organs no longer have the possibility of operating by direct administrative methods. But other mechanisms of influence must be sought. Sitting twiddling one's thumbs and saying: I see nothing, I hear nothing—that means damaging the party's authority. In a word, the Control Commission has many questions to ask during the checks and monitoring.

And something about another problem. The control commissions have quite a broad range of work. This requires very intensive work, and we have few full-time workers. Even the chairmen of our control commissions mostly fulfill their duties as a social function, combining them with another job.

How should this be handled? Of course we must pursue a policy of organizing things and training people as best we can. In this sphere we must collaborate closely with the All-Army Party Committee and party committees in the localities; but we would like to see greater assistance being given in this respect by communists in military-political organs.

Baltic Republics

Estonian Government Takes Economic Measures

LD0207171591 Tallin Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1400 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] Several items on the agenda of the Estonian Government session today were related to the change to free-market prices effective today. Commissions with extensive powers have been set up in districts and towns. These commissions are to be headed by mayors and district elders who will monitor prices.

Fixed prices will be retained for a range of milk products and will be guaranteed by the state. Among these products are ordinary milk, buttermilk, skim milk, soft cheese, and curd cheese with 9 percent fat content. The government has allocated 148 million rubles [R] for cost-of-living compensation in the third quarter, and the role and authority of local bodies over compensation have been increased. The government established R200 as the minimum income; up until now it has been R135.

The setting up of state reserves of goods for the next year was also discussed. It was decided to abandon the state order, while establishing the government's preferential right to buy up to 20 percent of the production of the enterprises located on state property.

At the initiative of the Ministry of Finance the Estonian Sugar Company was set up. It will have to deal with the critical problem of supplying the republic with sugar.

On the basis of historical continuity the Constitution of the Russian Society was registered, and other matters were discussed.

Conference on Baltic Russians Opens in Tallinn

LD0107162391 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1400 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Excerpts] ETA reports that today the Russians in the Baltics regional conference opened in Tallinn. In the course of two days scientists, representatives of Russian cultural societies in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and guests from Russia and from other Union republics will be discussing the issue of the Baltic Russians' cultural autonomy, history, present, and future. Issues of Russian-language education, as well as publishing the economic issues, will be dealt with. [passage omitted]

As Dmitriy Mikhailov, chairman of the Russian Society in Estonia, said to ETA, the present meeting of representatives of Russian societies in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—and the Russians in the Baltics conference—are yet another step toward coordinating their activity. A previous conference of this kind took place in Vilnius last December, and another one is planned to be organized next year in Riga.

Gary Hart Urges Investment in Latvia

LD0107201791 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] Riga July 1 TASS—Latvian Parliament chief Anatolijs Gorbunovs and former U.S. Senator Gary Hart, who represents the private-owned international strategies company, today discussed prospects for mutually beneficial contacts between the Baltic Republics and the United States.

Hart pointed out that the exchange of views was rather successful. In his view, the political and economic situation in Latvia is favourable for the development of trade relations with America.

Hart believes that investments by U.S. entrepreneurs may help develop the economic infrastructures of the republic, particularly in the sphere of communications and transport.

The U.S. senator is convinced of immense potentialities of such cooperation that would meet the interests of Latvia and the United States and would be of benefit to their business communities.

Hart voiced hope that the U.S. Congress and the Senate would take a decision promoting contacts between the U.S. and Latvia.

Landsbergis Cited on Visits to France, Germany

Gives Airport Interview

LD0107230591 Vilniuis Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, gave an interview to correspondents of Vilnius radio, TV, and ELTA at Vilnius airport.

There were very many meetings, very important political discussions and agreements; there will be many new things and these will be numerous in our relations with France, said Vytautas Landsbergis giving a resume on his trip.

He pointed out the European Council Parliamentary Assembly which took place in Helsinki where the chairmen of the three Baltic states and the representatives of the opposition gave their testimony. The Soviet delegation also attended. This was the first such discussion at an international forum, where matters were explained in the presence of the world. In a sense the ice has been broken here.

Speaking about his trip to Germany—the chairman of the Supreme Council paid two visits during the recent trip—Vytautas Landsbergis stressed the meetings with leaders of Schlewsig-Holstein lands, the chairman of the German Bundesrat, prominent officials of the present government and prime ministers of all of Germany.

The last discussion which was very interesting took place yesterday at midnight with Helmut Schmidt, former chancellor of the FRG.

Prime Ministers of the former East German regions showed great interest in the comparison of processes in the post-communist situation in our country and theirs. The last three days of our trip, Landsbergis stressed, were devoted to our future relations with Germany which has taken an active and new look at Lithuania.

Details 'Political' Meetings

LD0207135291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0731 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Excerpts] A briefing took place this morning at the Supreme Council attended by the chairman of the Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis. He described his visit to France, French cities, Norway, Helsinki and Germany.

Speaking of his visit to Germany, Landsbergis said:

[Begin recording] [Landsbergis] There were many political meetings, they were not such protocol meetings. There was a meeting with the Hamburg mayor, who is at the same time the president of the Bundesrat, the chairman of the second German house, with the prime ministers of the German laender. There was a meeting in Kiel. The Baltic countries were represented there. It was attended by the Estonian delegation. There were no Latvian representatives, but talks concerned future economic and political cooperation between the Baltic states, Scandinavia and northern Germany, between countries linked by the Baltic basin. Northern Germany is very interested in it, and there are many opportunities for such cooperation. [passage omitted]

There were also meetings with two ministers of the federal government, the minister of social and labor affairs, Blum, and the minister of defense, Stoltenberg. [passage omitted] I had an opportunity to talk for one and a half hours with a great politician former federal chancellor Helmut Schmidt. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified speaker] Could you tell us how this trip contributed to the internationalization of the Lithuanian issue, and also about Germany's stand?

[Landsbergis] [passage omitted] The issue is international. It has been such since 1940. But attempts are being made to present it, in a distorted manner, as the Soviet Union's internal affair. But they do not succeed. [passage omitted] The issue is international. If you ask about Germany's stand, it had started changing noticeably before our trip. This could be seen during this trip, of course, with some relics of realpolitik, when one or another politician sees that the real side seems to be more decisive than the purely legal side of the matter. But, they are not sufficiently familiar with the real side of our work and life here in Lithuania and how we are implementing the existence of the independent state with great interference from outside. We live according to our laws and our temporary constitution [passage indistinct] and our statehood, although it is being restricted in the sphere of international relations or border control. But, Lithuania is managing its affairs seperately, independently. [passage omitted] The Soviet Union is becoming a country which interferes in Lithuania's affairs. Of course, the acts of terror which took place while we were there were received under protest. In some respects, these have been useful, in the sense that when we are threatened each day with any possible action, like, for instance, cutting off the communication system surrounding parliament, and so on, then how long could Europe observe this? What was going to happen next? Would they render assistance to such an aggressive country and, thus, approve its actions? I have formulated this issue rather synonymously until it does not return the television buildings and withdraws the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] from Lithuania. This would be assistance for the assailant, assistance for the aggressor. This would be a stand against Lithuania. [passage omitted] [end recording]

New Lithuanian Military Commanders Announced

LD0307090191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] According to the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY, Colonel (Aleksandr Gorkushin) has been appointed commander of the Vilnius Garrison in place of the notorious General Uskhopchik. The recent graduate of the General Staff academy will take up his duties upon his return from leave. The Main Personnel Directorate of the Ministry of Defense has confirmed this.

Colonel (Nikolay Mironenko) will replace General (Zhitnikov) as commander of the division of USSR Interior Ministry [MVD] Internal Troops stationed in Lithuania. The USSR MVD confirmed this and added that Colonel (Goncharenko) continues to control Special Purpose Militia Detachment actions in Vilnius [word indistinct].

Black Beret Activities Throughout Union Reviewed

LD0207163891 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Excerpts] The special purpose police are called in the Baltic republics and other republics in the Soviet Union the Black Berets. Such units were set up in October of 1988 for protecting law and order, for freeing hostages, and for seizing large armed groups. There are now 34 special units, with a combined total of 10,000 men. Lately their work has begun to get a political hue. Some people believe that these units are used not only to protect the constitutional rights of citizens, but in order to destabilize the situation in some regions, which is beneficial for the conservative forces that are losing their grip on power. [passage omitted]

An officer who took part in the operation, Major Vladimir Vasvordov, has said in an interview for Radio Moscow that the unit dealt only with one customs point:

[Begin Vasvordov recording in Russian with superimposed translation to English] We had information that at their customs checkpoint, members of the Lithuanian Department for Protection of the Republic had firearms, which are forbidden to keep. As a result of our operation, one carbine and one pistol were seized. There were no casualties. [end recording]

Whatever the case, an investigation is under way into the demolition of the customs post. It is actually possible that was a provocation. [passage omitted] Maj. Vladimir Vasvordov again:

[Begin Vasvordov recording] Lithuania, just as Latvia, Estonia, Moldova, Belorussia, the Ukraine and other republics, are within the USSR. I was born in Latvia, and I'm now working in Lithuania. Personally, I believe that those who have come to power in our republic are fascists. We recognize the laws of the Soviet Union, and the laws of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. [end recording]

Since that interview with a black beret officer, the special police unit has carried out a number of actions that for some reasons coincided with special events on the Soviet domestic scene, when a certain progress was shaping in overcoming the crisis and ending the confrontation.

So far, it's not been announced on a single occasion officially who gave orders to the special purpose police, which has no right to act on its own initiative. Analysts believe that it would be impossible to find that out in the near future, and that if a number of actions by this unit are found illegal, the scapegoats will be commanding officers directly. [passage omitted]

OMON Not Within Oversight Committee's Purview

PM0207145991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[Item from roundup of PRAVDA, TASS, RIA reports: "The USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee"]

[Text] "According to its rules, the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has no right to issue a conclusion on the constitutionality of the activities of the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment]. Legislative acts, rather than specific actions, are the subject of the committee's scrutiny. Specific actions should be dealt with by the Prosecutor's Office." This was the reply by Committee Chairman Sergey Alekseyev to a question about his attitude to the OMON's actions in the Baltic region. "However, the situation in the Baltics is of serious concern to us," Alekseyev's Deputy Boris Lazarev added.

RSFSR

President Yeltsin Pays Visit to Novosibirsk

LD0207161891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] At a sitting of the Siberian Agreement Interregional Association, Russian President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, who is in Novosibirsk, has signed an order which underpins the association's action program from the normative and legal point of view. The association groups 17 republics, krays, and oblasts of the region.

It is raw material prices that were in the center of the discussion. The president's order envisages the possibility of going over to free prices on fuel, energy, and raw material resources from 1992. Moreover, as of 1 September this year, the region will be able to sell up to 25 percent of this production at market prices. It is sufficient to name but one figure in order to assess the significance this new procedure has for siberia: a fourth of the region's industry belongs to the raw material sector.

The sitting ended with applause which, to a considerable extent, was addressed to Yeltsin for his good will in the search for a compromise. The president got an even warmer welcome on the streets, when he was acquainting himself with the town.

Signs Decree

OW0207111391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In Novosibirsk on Monday, Russia's President-elect Boris Yeltsin conferred with the leaders of a number of republics, territories, regions and autonomous districts within Siberia, and with members of the regional economic association SIBIRSKOYE SOGLASHENIYE (Siberian Agreement). The latter organization was set up last October to work for a higher degree of integration and cooperation among various Siberian regions during the nation's transition to the market.

After the conference the RSFSR leader signed a decree giving SIBIRSKOYE SOGLASHENIYE a wide scope of rights, including to control 10 percent of Siberia's industrial output, authorize barter deals, and grant general licenses.

As he described to the Novosibirsk conference his Sunday's meeting with President Mikhail Gorbachev, Mr. Yeltsin said Russia was opposed to 5 provisions of the new Union Treaty, the major controversy being the principles of taxation. The Russian Federation favored a one-channel system of collecting taxes, since a two-channel system would deprive it of 100 billion rubles annually. According to Yeltsin, neither side was going to

give in, which might result in Russia's endorsement of the Union Treaty with reservations.

Mr. Yeltsin said as soon as he was sworn in as the first president of Russia, he would issue a decree transferring all of the Union property on Russian territory to the republic's jurisdiction, except for the areas which the Russian Federation was ready to entrust to central control, namely, the power industry, the railroads, and defense.

Economic Model Detailed

LD0107134291

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1105 GMT on 1 July carries a 2.5 minute report by (Oleg Kruzhov) from the oblast soviet building in Novosibirsk. He notes a session of the Council of the Association of the Siberian Agreement has just ended. It was attended by Yeltsin. He goes on to explain that its aim is to expand the production, technical, and scientific potential of a huge region in the east of the country, and to work out an economic model and develop horizontal economic links between individual enterprises, and all the territories. He continues: "Those at the meeting—the chairpeople of the soviets of people's deputies of the Siberian territories, and Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the republic—discussed article by article a draft document entitled "Question of the Activity of the Interregional Association of the Siberian Agreement: Directive of the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic." Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin signed this directive."

Kruzhov ends his report by pointing out that the territories will now have greater powers to dispose of their economic assets. He lists some examples.

Views Problems With Union Treaty

LD0107230191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] At a meeting with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev on 30 June, Boris Yeltsin told him that Russia still has five questions on which the republic disagrees with the provisions of the Union treaty. The chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet announced this in Novosibirsk where he is on a visit. One of these questions, Yeltsin continued, is the principle of taxation. Russia advocates a one-channel and the center advocates two-channel system of levying taxes. In Boris Nikolayevich's opinion, neither Russia nor the Union intend to retreat from their positions. Therefore he does not rule out a situation in which Russia would sign the Union treaty with the reservation that it did not agree with a number of articles. In a special statement the members of the Siberian Agreement Association supported the position of the Russian leader. It only remains to add that in the event of two-channel taxation Russia loses annually 100 billion rubles, and moreover such a system contravenes the existing republican law on taxation.

Yeltsin: 'Uphill Struggle' To Build New Russia

OW0107092691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Participants in Mr. Yeltsin's election campaign and members of the volunteer committee who had worked to get him elected as Russia's President held a party in Moscow on June 28. In his speech at the party, Mr. Yeltsin pointed out that the election campaign "had in many ways been dishonest, dirty and unscrupulous. But I am no longer surprised when I see my name sullied again and again".

He also said that the election victory is only the beginning and that "we face in uphill struggle to build a new Russia." According to Yeltsin, after 10 days have elapsed since his inauguration as president he will have to give account to people. "We have a programme, we have people, we know for whom and how we shall work", the first President of Russia emphasized.

Yeltsin Urged To Support Independent TV Network

OW0207083091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] After the USSR President and Cabinet of Ministers ordered the transfer of the Leningrad TV network, together with its fixed assets and other propety, under the control of the National TV and Radio Company, the Leningrad City Council (LenSoviet) held a meeting that issued a statement censuring the president's and the government's attempt "to ignore the LenSoviet decision to restructure Leningrad TV in compliance with Article 151 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitution." The decision in question envisaged the transformation of the Leningrad Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting into a shareholding company called LENTELERADIO which would offer 33 percent of its stock to the National TV and Radio Company.

The LenSoviet urged Russia's President-elect Boris Yeltsin to "support the idea of sovereignty and independence for Leningrad TV as one of the prerequisites for the signing of the new Union treaty by Russia."

Supreme Soviet Concerned About SFRY Events

LD0107211691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1730 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet has issued a statement which expresses concern over the development of events in friendly Yugoslavia, and deep regret over the fact that the civil

conflict has caused loss of human life. We are sure, the statement says, that the parties to the conflict will find ways of solving the problems facing them on the basis of negotiations, and without resorting to the use of force.

Tatarstan President Views Union Treaty Issues

LD0107201491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1630 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] Many people today are interested in Tatarstan's special stance regarding the Union treaty. Republic President Shaymiyev voiced his view on this matter to a TASS correspondent. If Tatarstan is permitted to sign the Union treaty directly and independently, we can adopt it in full. If not, then we cannot agree with certain articles of the document as they infringe our rights which result from the declaration of state sovereignty of the republic. Our republic, stressed the president of Tatarstan, is planning to sign the Union treaty along with the full quota of representatives. We cannot agree with any other decision. This standpoint has already taken possession of the people of Tatarstan. In connection with this, we face a new round of talks with Russian President Yeltsin.

Shakhray Assails Draft Union Treaty

PM0207141591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 91 pp 1, 2

["Point of View" interview with Sergey Shakhray, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Legislation Committee, by observer Olga Burkaleva; no place or date of interview given: "The Union Treaty. What Does It Hold in Store for Russia's People?"]

[Text] [Burkaleva] Russia has elected its own president for the first time in its history. Russians have thus opted for democratic reforms, having voted for our society's political renewal and for the dismantling of the administrative edict system. Very many people believe that bright and cloudless prospects are actually emerging now before Russia, as well as before many other republics.

Evidently, the new Union treaty will accelerate the process of these transformations?

[Shakhray] As far as Russia is concerned the Union treaty, as published and submitted to the republics' supreme soviets for approval and signature, means an end to political transformations, the slowing down or abandonment of radical economic reform, and consequently the abandonment of hopes for an early improvement in life.

[Burkaleva] Do you mean that the signing of the Union treaty in its present form could do away with all democratic transformations, right up to and including presidential power in Russia?

[Shakhray] Yes, insofar as this Union treaty destroys Russian statehood, thus eliminating the very foundations of democratic transformations. After all, the abolition of the Russian state will mean that all RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] laws, on which political and economic reforms are based, will cease to operate.

[Burkaleva] Which articles of the draft Union treaty contain such provisions?

[Shakhray] First, the article about membership of the Union. Under this article the former Union republics and the former autonomous republics which are members of, for example, the RSFSR will be joining the Union on identical terms.

But each member republic of the RSFSR is part of the Russian state. And yet it is planned that it will join the Union on par with the whole of which it is a part. In this case, the RSFSR is the whole. But if a part of it acquires the same rights as the whole, it itself becomes a whole. And in such a case, naturally, the former autonomous republics will cease being parts of the RSFSR.

Second, look at the way the article on citizenship is presented in the draft Union treaty. It contains a deficiency which could develop into a major problem. A situation may develop whereby a citizen of a republic which is a member of the RSFSR will be a citizen of the USSR but not a citizen of the RSFSR, in other words a citizen of the state of which his republic is a member.

The question of citizenship has more than just an abstract juridical or political significance. Presently, the citizenship norm contained in the draft Union treaty means that RSFSR laws on land reform, pensions, indexation of incomes, preferential taxation, and others will cease to operate for the population inhabiting autonomous republics like Bashkiria or Karelia, for example.

In order to prevent this happening, the Union treaty must stipulate: "A citizen of a state belonging to the Union is simultaneously a citizen of the USSR. A citizen of a republic which is a member of another republic is also a citizen of the latter republic."

Third. Article 11 of the draft Union treaty logically crowns the threat—which I have only just described—that Russian laws will cease to operate, since it essentially enshrines that the laws of any republic which is a member of the RSFSR have supremacy over the laws of the Russian Federation itself on all matters.

Fourth. The Union treaty's article on territories has been most unsuccessfully formulated. It essentially introduces state borders between the Russian Federation and the republics which are members of it.

Hitherto Russia's member republics have had borders with neighboring krays and oblasts within the RSFSR but not with the Russian Federation itself. The existence of borders within the state means that these territories are being de facto taken away from Russia. This merits

special attention: In conformity with the declaration on RSFSR State Sovereignty, the right to resolve questions on changes to Russia's borders, and consequently on its territorial integrity, is vested exclusively in the RSFSR's multinational people via an all-Russian referendum.

[Burkaleva] So, what does all this mean?

[Shakhray] The territory is being destroyed. Citizenship is being abolished. Russian laws cease to operate.

All in all, this means that the Russian state itself is being eliminated.

[Burkaleva] R. Abdulatipov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, is one of the authors of the new draft Union treaty in the form in which it is being discussed. During the chamber's 26 June sitting, you sharply criticized both the draft Union treaty and R. Abdulatipov (as one of those who drafted it) and even demanded his resignation?

[Shakhray] I am profoundly convinced that it is impossible to simultaneously head Russia's Soviet of Nationalities and take part in the elaboration of documents which would inevitably lead to the disintegration of the multinational Russian state.

[Burkaleva] So what is the way out of the prevailing situation? Is it possible to adhere to the principles of republics' equality when signing the Union treaty and, at the same time, to avoid Russia's fragmentation into "separate principalities?"

[Shakhray] In my view, there is a way out. The republics can and must participate in the creation of the Union and be parties to it. In this case, however, we ought to talk about a "composite member." Russia and its member republics are members of the Union: There is no Russia in the Union without these republics, but there are no republics separate from the RSFSR. Otherwise we might end up with a "cocktail," made up of a confederate Russia within a federal Union.

Collaboration within a composite member is regulated by the Federal and Union treaties and by bilateral and multilateral treaties and agreements. Moreover, in addition to the powers specified in the Federal and other treaties with the RSFSR, the RSFSR member republics ought to be given the right to autonomously transfer to Union organs any of their powers or, on the hand, to be given such powers by the Union.

This is how the principle of equality and the principle of one state's voluntary incorporation in another could be interpreted in the case of composite members: Russia, together with its member republics, enjoys equal rights and bears equal responsibilities with the other Union republics.

[Burkaleva] And how could the republics exercise their right to free secession from the Union? After all, judging by the draft text, a former autonomous republic is legally given the right to secede from the Union without seceding from the RSFSR?

[Shakhray] Yes, the last part of the draft's Article 1 does contain this—to put it mildly—strange provision. In my view, the states composing the Union retain the right to freely secede from it under the procedure laid down by the parties to the treaty. A state, being a member of another state, could exercise the right to secede from the Union jointly with the state of which it is a member.

[Burkaleva] And now we come to the federal treaty, because its actual purpose is to regulate relations within collective members, with the Russian Federation—according to you—being one such member.

[Shakhray] Russia should not sign the Union treaty before determining its own federal structure. But as currently proposed, the federal treaty brings Russia to the brink of feudal fragmentation. According to the new draft, not only the former autonomous formations but also the krays, oblasts, and the cities of Moscow and Leningrad ought to become parties to the federal treaty. A total of 88 members. Furthermore, under the new draft Union treaty, some of them will also be members of the Union.

[Burkaleva] This means that, given a "favorable" development of circumstances, we will soon be given an opportunity to have presidents and parliaments in Tambov or Nizhniy Novgorod, as well as customs with all the ensuing consequences?

[Shakhray] Of course this sounds more like a joke, but such games are far from harmless. Here we have a precondition for a new round of the war of laws, a breeding ground for "Karabakhs" deep inside Russia. The former autonomous formations, exercising the right to secede from the RSFSR "gifted" to them by the Union treaty, will "gain" a sharp exacerbation of interethnic tension because huge numbers of Russians live there. You can see what might happen!

[Burkaleva] An uninitiated person, someone who is not a deputy, someone who is detached from politics, may find the entire situation around the Union and federal treaties nothing more than verbal and legislative juggling, moreover a juggling which could lead—as people love saying nowadays—to unpredictable consequences. What driving force activated the gigantic system known as "our state" by informing it about centrifugal forces whose actions may lead to the disintegration of a formerly great state into splinters of tiny "appanage" formations?

[Shakhray] In my view, it was the administrative edict system which is now collapsing and is using all means in the struggle for its political survival. The nucleus of this system is in the center. This is not the same as the Union. The rusting vertical structures of central power penetrate all republics and territories, the center is supranational, it has clearly visible party hues. The center may grow

stronger and the Union may collapse as a result. On the other hand, the six republics' withdrawal from the treaty process has somehow strengthened the center's positions. In the same way as the resignation of a large number of honest Communists has strengthened the party apparatus' positions....

In my view, the center is pursuing a hypocritical policy in its relations with Russia today. In its dialogue with Russia it seems to be promising one thing, but its line is completely different in talks with some former autonomous formations behind Russia's back.

Nowadays all political processes occurring in the country and the republics ought to be examined from the viewpoint of the struggle for power between two main political forces. One of them is the old guard of the administrative edict system and the CPSU nomenklatura, headed by the center. The other is represented by democrats who strive to build power on the new principles of power by the people.

[Burkaleva] The democrats' positions were strengthened following the 23 April 1991 signing of the Nine plus One joint accord. The articles of this accord enshrined provisions to the effect that only the present Union republics can be parties to the Union treaty. This consolidated the positions which brought the republics themselves to the accord as a result of joint discussions. It enshrined Russia's right to sign the Union treaty as a composite member. Bearing in mind that the Russian parliament is now acting as the "generator" of laws aimed at society's consistent democratization, this accord actually vested in it the right to continue its work along this avenue.

The published draft Union treaty, in the event of its being signed, will provide a powerful response by the conservatives: After all, their positions are still very strong at the top of the USSR Supreme Soviet and at the level of former autonomous republics, krays and oblasts, and several Union republics. A response to B. Yeltsin's nationwide election (after all, the election results mean only that the democrats' positions are being strengthened and that they have gained a "political space" where democratic transformations could be effected). This is the essence of conservative maneuvers: Your president gained victory, so let us leave him without a state where the ideas of democracy and progress might materialize.

It looks as if we are in a vast political theater, awaiting the next act of a play in which, according to the script prepared by Staraya Ploshchad [CPSU Central Committee headquarters], the conservatives are again ready to cross rapiers with the democrats over the division of spheres of political influence. The questions of national-territorial structure are, if I might use the expression, nothing but window dressing.

[Shakhray] This is probably the underlying purpose of the center's scheme: To bring to the surface a diluted thin layer of democratic power, concentrated in Russia's Supreme Soviet. If this happens and the Union treaty is signed in its present from, without any amendments being introduced to the aforementioned key elements, the entire work on overcoming the power vacuum in Russia will have been in vain. The Russian president will be the first president without a state and will be unable to accomplish anything of what the people have mandated him to accomplish.

Actually, in its complex political game with the autonomous formations, the center is banking not so much on the peoples' national dignity but on the political orientation of local authorities, playing the national card in this political game. From all points of view, this is a shortsighted policy, giving the conservatives a temporary tactical gain in the event of the Union treaty's being signed in its present form, but threatening a long-term strategic defeat not only for Russia but for the Union as a whole. A strong Union cannot exist without a strong Russia, the cornerstone of its foundations. Russia's weakening is also strategically dangerous for the other parties to the Union treaty, since it threatens long-term instability of mutual relations within the Union's framework and interethnic squabbles.

I think that the signing of the Union and federal treaties as they are at present would be a juridical enshrinement of the Russian Federation's disintegration. History will never forgive us taking such a step.

I am in favor of a Union treaty and a federal treaty. But treaties which would produce mechanisms for enhancing the republics' status, mechanisms leading to their prosperity within the framework of a single federation, not to their prosperity on the federation's ruins.

[Burkaleva] And what is the stance taken by the other republics?

[Shakhray] The majority, or in any event those which have no autonomous formations, are not directly affected by the problems I mentioned. But even they would ultimately end up as losers: Seeing that there will be no enhancement of the status of autonomous republics to the level of Union republics but, on the contrary, in the wake of Russia's disintegration, the status of former Union republics will decline (be leveled down) and will be diluted among dozens of republics. There will also be a substantial decline of their influence in supreme organs of power and management in the USSR.

But I would like to emphasize that the draft Union treaty is "not short on" articles which are unacceptable to all the republics as a whole and to each one individually.

[Burkaleva] Do you mean the draft's provisions about demarcation of powers between republics and the center?

[Shakhray] Not just that. There is an article about the future Union's constitution which is unremarkable on the surface. It thus guarantees a repetition of the fate which befell the 1922 Union treaty, when the republics' sovereignty was swiftly eliminated by the center by means of introducing constitutional amendments. The

Union Constitution must be adopted using a procedure which rules out any revision of the Union treaty. In other words, the Constitution itself and any amendments to it must be approved by all the republics' supreme organs of power.

But you are right, very many problems have been left unresolved by the articles on the demarcation of powers. They guarantee a revival of the center's diktat. For example: The Union's exclusive powers and the powers it shares with the republics will be exercised by Union organs!

Much, if not everything, depends on how the Union budget will be formed. At this stage, and in order to protect the republics' vital interests, we ought to opt for the so-called single-channel system, with the republics making contributions to the Union budget as laid down by agreement. One of the most developed countries—the FRG—uses such a system; its economy is flourishing and the federal state is not disintegrating. But if we have to give up the single-channel system, the Union treaty will have to include additional guarantees to protect the republics' interests.

[Burkaleva] What guarantees, for example?

[Shakhray] To start with, it is necessary to compile a list of the most necessary all-Union programs and the size of the republics' proportional payments for their implementation. Only then should we determine the size of Union taxes (in other words, no deductions for the program over and above taxes, but a sum paid over under the program, which would reduce the size of Union taxes). Union taxes and their collection are determined in coordination with the republics. There must be a uniform tax collection system and, consequently, a uniform system of organs. All taxes in the republics—Union and republican alike—must be collected by republican tax organs. There should no parallel Union "tax collectors." It is necessary to establish efficient monitoring by the republics of the formation and performance of the Union budget, as well as of money emission.

[Burkaleva] So what is your general conclusion?

[Shakhray] The Union treaty needs very serious and urgent additional work.

Silayev: Soviet Cabinet Action 'Robbing Russia'

OW0107041691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1400 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Prime Miniser of the Russian Federation Ivan Silayev qualifies the course of action proposed by the USSR Cabinet as "robbing Russia".

He made a report to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on Friday following ruling No. 360 of June 15 by the USSR Cabinet "On Organisational Measures for Industrial Programmes and Forecasts of Social and Economic Development of the Regions and Republics of the USSR for 1992 in Conditions of forming Market Relations."

Ivan silayev described the ruling as a return to the old system of administration by command. The Cabinet "has actually prepared a new taxation system without attracting public notice," ruling a new federal tax. That would cut the budget of the Russian Federation by 73 billion roubles, explained Silayev.

The ruling goes back on the earlier agreement of the republics with the centre on their economic independence. The document was a surprise to all the signatories of the 9+1 agreement and had been "probably tailored for the emergency powers requested that day by Pavlov from the USSR Supreme Soviet."

Russia's premier expressed confidence that such robbery will not be tolerated and that Russia, the Ukraine, Kazakhstan and some other republics will counter by nationalizing the entire property on their territories.

Ivan Silayev informed the session that June 20 he was speaking in the Kremlin against the Cabinet's ruling and was supported by the Ukraine, Belorussia, and other republics. But the pledge that followed to reckon with the republics was not honoured. Consequently, went on Ivan Silayev, on Thursday the Presidium of the Russian Federation's Council of Ministers decided to ban the USSR Cabinet's ruling before it's brought in line with the wishes of the republics.

To the question about the position of the USSR President Silayev replied that he phoned Gorbachev yesterday and had the following response, "How can anyone issue rulings in our time without consulting the republics?"

Conference on Russian Interests Abroad Noted

PM0207090091 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jun 91 p 1

[Vitaliy Buzuyev report: "A 'Window' Into Europe. On the Problems of Representing Russian Interests Abroad"]

[Text] From the foreign policy point of view, Russia has been stewing in its own juice for decades. The vigilant "cook" who kept an eye on this process had a moustache and wore boots. And in the same way that we used to, we are setting the "dish" that he once prepared on the diplomatic table—this is the opinion of a number of participants at the scientific and practical conference "Russia in the Modern World" that is being held at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] House of Soviets.

V. Lukin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs and Foreign Economic Relations, expressed himself unequivocally:

Soviet Embassies, the outposts of USSR foreign policy, have still not rid themselves of the birthmarks of Comintern ideology.

Developing this theme, V. Sirotkin, a section head at the USSR Foreign Ministry Diplomatic Academy, noted that to talk today of returning to Leninist foreign policy principles is strange at the very least. The 1924 Constitution, on which foreign policy in the twenties and thirties was based, contained the so-called fuse of confrontation. "The world will belong either to us or to the bourgeoisie," Bukharin wrote at the time. The Bolshevik permanent representations also worked on the basis of this blueprint. Their main aim was to prepare world revolution. They intended to fan a "conflagration" in Germany in 1923, and even named an exact date—9 November; then in Estonia in 1924 and in Shanghai in 1927.

Comintern members working on the staff of permanent representations made their contribution to the implementation of this blueprint. Then, when the Comintern was disbanded, its personnel were partly transferred to other departments and partly remained in the embassies where secret departments were also formed out of them.

Russia should break onto the world stage by taking the place of these personnel, V. Sirotkin believes.

One major problem is how the republic can uphold its sovereign principles abroad. We know that today all embassies work on the principle of management by a single person. And at present the way things work is extremely simple. Russia receives a staff quota in a given embassy, but its diplomats are automatically subordinate to the USSR ambassador and thus Russia loses its "separate identity."

Incidentally, the draft of the new Union treaty does not as yet possess a clear-cut mechanism enabling us to define how Russia's foreign policy activity should be realized. The draft clarifies very little. The foreign policy competence of the center and the republics is not demarcated. The roles are intentionally ill-defined, V. Lukin believes, since in these circumstances the Union will always be able to foist its position on a republic. These inconsistencies will nevertheless be overcome sooner or later, and we must hope they will be overcome to the advantage of republics.

We must make provision for many things. Including, it seems, traditional forms of official diplomacy that are realized within the framework of friendship societies. A large proportion of these are currently collapsing. Today their role in establishing friendly relations with other countries has been reduced virtually to zero. There is no hard currency either. But everyone knows that considerable amounts of money were invested in the infrastructure of these societies. For example, the USSR-France society owns a mansion in the center of Paris. There are plans to use it for commercial purposes. Commodity exchanges and joint enterprises are already looking at it with considerable interest. But why should it not be used for diplomatic purposes along with other friendship society buildings, primarily with Russia's interests in mind?

A number of original suggestions about the face Russia should present on the international scene were made during the scientific and practical conference. They will all be systematized and submitted to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the republic's Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the form of recommendations.

Justice Minister Discusses Tasks, Goals

PM0307105191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Jun 91 p 2

[Interview with RSFSR Justice Minister Nikolay Fedorov by Vladimir Sheleketov under the rubric "The Revival Program. A Minister's Opinion;" date and place not given; first paragraph is an introduction: "Nikolay Fedorov: Justice on the Cheap Exacts Too High A Price"]

[Text] RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Justice Minister Nikolay Fedorov is perhaps the youngest member of the Russian Government: He celebrated his 33rd birthday the other day.

[Shelektov] First, Nikolay Vasilyevich, our congratulations and, second... is it tough being a minister in your early thirties?

[Fedorov] Believe me, I never wanted this, although the "ability" of our ministers has always made me feel uneasy. I studied science and tried to find the truth—scientific and theoretical, a kind of philosopher's stone. And even two years ago I could not have guessed that I would find myself in such high political orbit.

I was a senior university lecturer and had begun writing my doctoral thesis. Maybe on becoming a USSR people's deputy I showed greater activeness in certain areas and was more energetic as leader of a whole series of working parties engaged in drafting Union laws, including the Law on the Press and the Law on the Rights and Duties of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops. Personal work in which professional qualities are displayed, where you are not afraid to hold your own opinion and do not speak in the name of an anonymous "we," clearly makes a politician more noticeable.

In terms of my philosophical and political views I was closer to the platform of the democrats (without quotation marks), the professional democrats. To personalize it, I was closer to Yeltsin's platform. That is clearly why I received an invitation from the new Russian leadership to work as republic justice minister.

But the shortest and most objectively correct answer to your question is reflected, I think, in the saying "practice makes perfect."

[Sheleketov] What is a departmental leader in today's situation?

[Fedorov] In general every ministry represents an area of policy. To put it very simply, a minister has to be above all a contemporary of those who wish progress for society. And that means being able to anticipate the development of political processes many moves ahead. Undoubtedly a minister has to organize skillfully the work of his apparatus, but the main point is to politically determine with accuracy the present-day situation, to know where you are going in your work, and to propose reform within your own system to the government and legislators before the signs of crisis begin to manifest themselves in that system. If you cope with that, then you are the man for the job.

[Sheleketov] Have you inherited a tough legacy?

[Fedorov] Certainly, all the ministries of the nineties have a difficult legacy.

Standards and stereotypes created over decades do, after all, affect people. Soviet justice was so "cowed" and "down-trodden" that the Justice Ministry leadership even grew accustomed to being ignored in major-league politics. Given such a political stance and such a professional vision of the problems of justice, there was no point counting on the Justice Ministry fulfilling its mission, and yet its prime mission is to help establish a powerful, independent judiciary. A different approach to forming the judicial system's budget was achieved. The first major practical step toward implementing the political course of creating a really independent judiciary was thereby taken, because poverty-stricken justice or an indigent judge cannot be independent. Justice on the cheap exacts too high a price—for all of us. This is a hard-won axiom of our country's history.

[Sheleketov] Clearly not just money, but new personnel are needed, are they not?

[Fedorov] We have been engaged in developing legal education in the Russian Federation (we have been forced to do this). Today any program of the Russian or Union Government will fail for the very simple reason that there is a shortage of lawyers. The market economy means an economy governed by law and contract.

You will appreciate, however, that such lawyers do exist in Germany or the United States. In our country, because of the specific nature of the forecast of historical development and the political situation, they were, as you will recall, to disappear "basically" by the eighties. It was intended that the organs of self-government of society would themselves deal with conflicts. And the wisest (especially since it was alone in its wisdom) party—the CPSU—would resolve all these problems. And the secretary of the party committee or rayon party committee, or in an emergency the first secretary of the oblast party committee, would act as final arbiter.

In purely numerical terms, we have no shortage of lawyers. But even where there is a sufficiency of them, they have a quite different—antimarket—schooling. This schooling was created for Stalinist lawyers. For such lawyers the law means the discretion of the chief as expressed in an order or instruction by that same minister.

The government therefore passed the prepared resolution on developing legal education in Russia. It was signed in February and by now five new law faculties have opened in the republic. This is a policy of training a new generation which creates strategic safeguards ensuring the irreversibility of the processes of democratization, the market economy, and protection of human rights. We may go away, but strong people, people whose strength lies in knowledge and professionalism, will remain. They will not be made political dupes so easily. The sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet have demonstrated this. You yourself may have noticed how Gorbachev and Lukyanov are plainly fearful of powerful, well-informed lawyers. They are not to the liking of A. Sobchak and K. Lubenchenko either, because these lawyers are professionally able to show the utter untenability and anticonstitutional nature of proposals being made. But leaders value ignorant deputies who are all at sea in political and legal matters. Such people are convenient. Politics has always been made on the basis of such people. In our country Karl Marx's classical quotation that "Ignorance represents a huge force" has always been energetically in force, but I do not think that Marx counted on its being made the foundation of policy in the coming realm of socialism.

[Sheleketov] What other steps are being taken to create a really independent system of justice?

[Fedorov] We are now engaged in preparations for a congress of Russian judges. This will be the first such congress ever. And we will be submitting our proposals on major judicial reform in the Russian Federation to it. If we cope with this task, we will build an edifice, no, a palace of justice, of independent justice, which will look solely to the law.

[Sheleketov] And how are relations with the Union ministry shaping up?

[Fedrov] We are autonomous and in no way dependent upon it. I would like to say something else. I would like them to inform us about plans for draft laws and legislative work in the Cabinet of Ministers and the USSR parliament because there are problems which lie outside short-term political considerations and are universal legal problems.

The market economy, which the Union seems to have accepted, demands uniform and standard legislation to ensure that internal processes proceed in unison so that it may become part of the world economy. But our proposals are ignored. They do not want to talk with us. This is a policy of stalemate.

[Sheleketov] From the standpoint of legal backup, what are the reasons for the introduction of economic reforms being so slow?

[Fedorov] Two problems can be pinpointed here. The first is the lack of coordinated legislation between Russia and the Union. And yet when the mechanism for implementing the laws starts to function via various levers, such a lack of coordination results in their simply stymieing each other.

The second is that we do not have an adequately developed or skillfully and correctly formed legislative base.

Hence our tasks. First, to assist in the creation of new, civilized, if you will, legislation. Some things have already been done. People are energetically working on developing civil legislation—that is the basis of all legislation regulating property relations. Recently we submitted draft tax legislation. We will shortly issue a new criminal code, freed, if I may put it this way, from the grimace of totalitarianism.

Another basic task of ours is that we must help put already adopted laws, for all their shortcomings, into practice. Here I would like to cite an example. Recently a rayon people's court overturned on appeal a decision by a rayon soviet presidium refusing to allocate land for private farming. The court ordered that the rayon soviet allocate five kolkhoz members their share of kolkhoz land. And this, you will agree, is a noteworthy and historically significant event. A rayon court **ordering** a rayon soviet, where, in the old scheme of things, its party bosses sit and to whose nomenklatura the judge belongs and to which it used to have to go cap in hand. I personally am gladdened by this episode. I see it as the harbinger of a new legal and political ethos.

Minister Discusses Satellite Program

PM0207132591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Jun 91 p 3

[Interview with Vladimir Buldak, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] minister of communications, information technology, and space, by correspondent Vladimir Fedorov; time and place not given: "Sovereign Earth Satellite"]

[Text] A second Russian earth satellite will shortly be launched into geostationary orbit. How far is such a step justified today? Our correspondent talks with Vladimir Buldak, RSFSR minister of communications, information technology, and space.

[Buldak] The television corporation on Russian territory is the biggest in the world: 620 high-power transmitters, more than 7,000 space station receivers, around 8,000 retransmitters, plus a group of satellites serving five time zones. And yet 3 million citizens have no access whatsoever to television. Strange as it may seem, some 20,000 population centers in the European part of Russia fall outside the reception zones. The first Russian satellite was launched last November to resolve this problem. It is now up to the ground stations, which we are strenuously encouraging along with local organs of power. Next year everyone living in the European part will be able to watch Central Television's Channel One and Two. We will shortly be launching our second satellite, with a third at the end of the year. So Russian television together with All-Union Channel One will now be accessible to around 97 percent of the republic's population.

[Fedorov] And yet two channels for such a large republic, that is not very many?

[Buldak] We have proposed to the Council of Ministers a program for further development introducing another all-Russia channel by the end of 1995. So we recommend that everyone who has not yet acquired UHF units for their televisions should do so.

[Fedorov] How will the commercial aspect of it look and how advantageous is it to invest in these projects?

[Buldak] Even the old satellite models which we are launching enable us, in contemporary parlance, to do business. As soon as commercial television is on its feet and potential clients wake up to it, we will be able to recoup the cost of the satellites. That is wholly realistic. We received about 100 proposals to utilize the first satellite, although we satisfied only 30 applications.

[Fedorov] Not a single republic has yet attempted to encroach on the monopoly of Glavkosmos [Main Administration for the Development and Use of Space Technology for the National Economy and Scientific Research]. How, then, is this action to be carried out?

[Buldak] We were the first satellite purchasers in the country. We manufactured it at the Krasnoyarsk Applied Mechanics Asociation. We bought from the Missile Troops a standard Proton rocket capable of carrying five-tonne payloads into geostationary orbit. I would stress that this launch was not financed out of the Union budget, where no one takes any risk. We, however, risked a very great deal. We therefore had to insure the satellite launch at every stage. It came as a big surprise to all the country's insurance companies.

[Fedorov] I am curious to know what it costs to insure?

[Buldak] The Vostok Bank and the USSR Foreign Insurance Administration offered us their services. We opted for the latter, since there we were able to find international documentation for such cases very quickly. The first launch was insured at a 7 percent premium, at a cost of 650,000 rubles [R]. Now prices on everything have gone up.

[Fedorov] And yet you did manage to acquire a rocket, how did the sellers regard your approach?

[Buldak] Initially with bewilderment. But afterwards—it is Russia that is buying, Russia that is taking the risk—they got used to the idea.

[Fedorov] The republic pays R23 billion into the country's budget, and that includes paying for the upkeep of

Glavkosmos. It turns out that you have bought something for the taxpayers which they have already paid for. They have paid twice for the space vehicle.

[Buldak] Yes, but here the condition was that the utilization of the satellite will be dictated solely by the Russian Government and not by those departments which could impose a veto.

[Fedorov] You did this to gain freedom?

[Buldak] Quite right. It was the prime condition. We now have certain rights. Why "certain?" We have occupied a point in orbit which, according to the way the world is divided up, belongs to the USSR. The Union used to have a satellite there which came to the end of its operating life, and it had obligations toward the communications administrations of certain countries. Those obligations are now assumed by us, but the bulk of the satellite's operating capacity belongs to Russia.

[Fedorov] Does what we have now been talking about exhaust the scope of the last word in the title of your ministry?

[Buldak] Of course not, the ministry ensures expert appraisal of the resources that Russia invests in Union-wide space programs. Thus we submit figures to the government on the basis of which it can determine the advisability of investing resources in the Union budget and the size of those resources. A second question is the use of the groups of satellites—present and future—in Russia's interests. We are most interested of all in these systems. After all, many republics refuse to pay for space programs and regard them warily.

Our ministry is in charge of some studies and determines the economic backup for future satellites in the republic's interests. We maintain contacts with the chief designers of spacecraft and ground equipment. A satellite itself is only part of a system. For every R1 we invest in a satellite, 10 have to be invested in ground stations.

And the biggest area of problems is space communications systems. All satellites are in essence communications satellites to some extent. We intend in the very near future to put photographs from space on a commercial footing in the interests of agriculture, geology, cartography, and the environment. In short, to organize stores where an economic manager or entrepreneur can in exchange for a certain sum of money order services in the form of photographs, scanning, or monitoring.

[Fedorov] A satellite is an expensive undertaking. Joint ownership is therefore spreading in world practice. One multinational corporation brings together 150 countries. The lion's share of revenue accrues to the United States. Does the logic of events not lead Russia to such a partnership?

[Buldak] The Soviet Union is already a member of the Intersputnik international organization, whose services are enjoyed by 27 countries. We are now making efforts so that Russia also becomes a member, since it, too, owns spacecraft. As for the largest international space systems organization, Intelsat, the Union Government intends to join. A snag is that Western companies do not insure some Soviet satellites because they do not meet international requirements in certain respects. We are carrying out work in this regard with a number of Canadian companies which have expressed a desire to participate in the creation and future exploitation of satellites.

[Fedorov] Has the time come for you to consider the Russians living outside the republic? Twenty million is an impressive figure.

[Buldak] We are doing so right now. The satellite which we are launching will, at Kazakhstan's request, also operate on their territory. Moreover, we are inviting all Union republics to take part in our programs. Certain interest has already been shown here. It is intended with future launches of "Gals" satellites that their individual basic frequencies be used for Union republics and multizonal broadcasting in Russia. It is intended to organize this within individual regions by 1994. For example, Bashkiria is ready to invest money to construct an active transmitting station in Ufa. It will then be possible to provide national broadcasting in the foothills of the Urals and the Urals zone itself.

[Fedorov] Here you enter into a certain competition with Glavkosmos.

[Buldak] It does take place. But Russia is nevertheless receiving all that it would wish. Although the Union does try to keep everything in its own hands and to represent all these issues in the international arena. Unfortunately, that is the way the legislation is. We have a very difficult dialogue which sometimes results in a flat refusal and is not very agreeable for us. But there is nevertheless a movement in Russia's favor under way. We have been allocated slots for three of our satellites. There are guarantees that there will be a fourth and a fifth craft. And we are investing money in their development. So, despite the two systems—Union and republic—the republic system is beginning to occupy its rightful place.

Communist Party Secretary Zyuganov Interviewed

PM2706103191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview with G.A. Zyuganov, secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, by unnamed correspondent; date and place of interview not stated: "Responsibility, Restraint, Efficiency"]

[Text] [Correspondent] In recent weeks important events have occurred. And perhaps the main one was the election of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president. How do you assess the results of the election?

[Zyuganov] A thorough analysis and in-depth assessment of the results of the elections are still ahead. But it may

already be said that the people have expressed their attitude toward the policy which has been pursued in recent years on behalf of and under cover of the party. In my view the course it once took toward liberating labor and economic initiative and developing democracy is the correct one. But it is being implemented extremely inconsistently and with unjustified deviations. This has brought the country to the verge of national catastrophe, to the impoverishment of the main mass of working people, to civil strife, and the rampaging of lawlessness and crime. Perestroyka was seized by extreme right-wing forces seeking not to reform the social system but to turn it inside out. Society has grown tired of cataclysms. People are frightened by the endless destruction. They are increasingly seeking support in a strong arm....

[Correspondent] We can see that in reality power, at least in the RSFSR, is moving into the hands of forces which oppose the Communist Party. What is the nature of the Communists' attitude toward these new authorities?

[Zyuganov] The RSFSR Communist Party has proceeded and continues to proceed from the premise that the election of the president and the introduction of a new executive power is the result of the expression of the will of the majority of Russians who took part in the voting. This should determine the nature of our attitude—we are in favor of collaborating with the legitimate authorities. The Communists are sufficiently widely represented in the legislative organs. They should seek and find more persistently allies in the implementation of practical measures aimed at breaking the catastrophic situation in the republic and stabilizing the economic and political situation.

The Russian Communists who six years ago acted as the initiators of the radical renewal of society remain ardent supporters of reforms. We have objected and will object only to those methods of reform which paralyze economic relations, strike against people's prosperity, or flout the principles of social justice, from which only an insignificant proportion of resourceful people and, of course, criminal elements gain.

While preserving its allegiance to the ideals of liberated labor and social justice, the RSFSR Communist Party is prepared for constructive cooperation in the interests of the working people both with the organs of power and with all public and political forces of the republic—both those which supported the RSFSR president at the election and those which were in opposition to him. The times demand nationwide consensus for the sake of Russia's salvation and resurrection.

[Correspondent] Consensus on what specific basis?

[Zyuganov] People expect vigorous measures to ensure the necessary living conditions for working people, to prevent acute social conflicts, and to assert legality and guarantees of citizens' rights and security. It is time to stop the destruction of Russia's production forces and halt the decline of industrial and agricultural production. The RSFSR Communist Party will actively support all the constructive steps by the republic's president and government to provide the population with the necessary minimum of food and other consumer goods.

Efforts aimed at preserving the USSR—at fulfilling the will of the majority of Russians voiced via the 17 March referendum, at consolidating the sovereignty and integrity of the RSFSR, at asserting real freedom for the development of all peoples, at enhancing the effectiveness of the soviets, at improving the self-management of the population and labor collectives, and at strictly observing legality and law and order—will meet with firm support from the RSFSR Communist Party.

Our support is for all specific steps by the new authorities for the provision of accessible and high-quality education and health care, for the satisfaction of requirements for housing, vocational training and retraining, civilized leisure and development, for people's provision for themselves and their families through their own labor and talent, and for state and public support for socially unprotected strata of the population.... The republic's Communists will make every effort to ensure that the development of society and the state's policy led to the unity, not the division, of the population, to cooperation and not to confrontation.

[Correspondent] But where are the guarantees that an end will be put to anarchy and that you will succeed in avoiding new upheavals?

[Zyuganov] Executive power is being strengthened so that it can finally be used in the interests of the working people and the absolute majority of the population. People and society as a whole will not stand any more new upheavals caused by anarchy. I should like to hope that the present Russian authorities will not repeat obvious errors—will not start to cover up urgent matters with considerations of political expediency, destructive actions, and glib promises not confirmed by deeds. I hope that for the president and the new government the basic goal will be primarily the real prosperity of the working people and not of a narrow group of people. In that one sees guarantees that new upheavals will be successfully avoided and civil consensus asserted. If the forces of an extremist nature try for example to use presidential power for the enforced implantation of private ownership, albeit under the flag of democratization, then it is not hard to suppose where that will lead. There will be an acceleration of the stratification of society and a drastic deterioration in the social protection of an enormous section of the population—children, young people, pensioners, young families. Mass unemployment will arise. The basic gains of the working people—free medical services, free education, the state allocation of housing—will be lost.... It is clear that in this situation social contradictions will be sharply aggravated.

I want to stress once again that the Communists will support the policy and practical steps of the president and government which accord with the working people's

vital interests. At the same time they will defend their positions consistently, by all legal means. They cannot keep silent, still less support antipopular, anticonstitutional actions if they are manifested in the policy of the new authorities. I repeat: Our interests are the interests of the broad strata of working people and not of some narrow social group or stratum.

[Correspondent] The Communist Party is experiencing a time of hard ordeals. To withstand them it must obviously change?

[Zyuganov] I am sure that under the conditions which have taken shape we must embark resolutely on the in-depth renewal of the party and the alteration of its nature and identity. In the very near future there will be an RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee plenum at which it is planned to discuss questions of the strategy and tactics of the party's activity under the new conditions. We must comprehensively assess the political realities which have taken shape and analyze the processes of social development in the republic. We must clearly formulate our goals for the immediate future. It is clear that party cadres will be required to display a high degree of professionalism. Only on this condition is it possible to ensure the party's parliamentary, analytical forecasting, agitation and propaganda, and organizational activity.

[Correspondent] What lessons does the party draw from the recent election campaign?

[Zyuganov] Today you can read and hear many opinions which come down to the following conclusion—the Communist Party has suffered a crushing defeat. Well, the defeat is obvious. But one must know how to lose and, most important, to derive lessons from it. And I venture to assert that we are assimilating this skill. And that is the main lesson. I already said at the start of our talk that the political course which has disillusioned the working people and led the country to the verge of catastrophe has suffered defeat. But the same course has been steered and is being vigorously steered by the present victorious "democrats," only they are cunningly concealing the fact. Well, as they say, only for so long.... We dissociate ourselves from an antipopular policy.

He who reckons that the Communist Party will start to panic and be demoralized is profoundly in error. I think that on the contrary the results of the election will accelerate the Communists' cohesion and strengthen their ranks. In the process of rapid preparation for the election the RSFSR Communist Party had already made a serious attempt to organize and mobilize the efforts of local party organs and primary organizations to active political work. It is important that we treat attentively the experience accumulated in this political struggle and make skillful use of it in our daily activity. The populism which our opponents have adopted unfortunately largely determines public opinion today. And some time more will be needed for people to understand and accept the Communists' truth.

[Correspondent] What in your view could be put at the basis of the steady development of the republic and the country?

[Zyuganov] Primarily the conservation and consolidation of statehood. Only a strong, united country will prevent anyone from turning our peoples into providers of unpaid labor used in ecologically harmful production facilities, that into industrial slaves of the 21st century. Only a strong, united state will prevent our natural resources from being plundered by other countries whose own stocks are running out. We must do everything possible to halt the collapse of the base sectors of our own economy, to preserve nature, to safeguard culture, and to defend the rights of the individual. In my view those are the priorities which can and must consolidate everyone irrespective of ideological views and political bias.

[Correspondent] It is well known that for a long time the CPSU regarded itself as the party of all the people. What in your view is its present social base? On whom does it rely?

[Zyuganov] The party will be in an uncertain position as long as it regards itself as the party of all the people.... The stratification in society is proceeding very actively and people are emerging to express the views of different social strata and groups. Our social base is the working people: the workers, peasants, and working intelligentsia. Reflecting their fundamental interests, we shall seek the repeal of the extortionate prices, the restriction of the activity of shadow economy dealers and speculators who belong to cooperatives and the repeal of laws which encroach on the rights of the individual and we shall come out with a legislative initiative on the prohibition of the activity of movements which kindle nationalism and separatism.

In mutual relations with workers and peasants we shall support their desire to take a practical part in the implementation of economic reforms, firmly defend the right to choose forms of ownership and economic activity, and seek the adoption of legislative acts which ensure equivalent exchange between the city and the countryside. In mutual relations with the intelligentsia we shall come out for rendering state aid in the development of science, culture, and national education and increasing appropriations for such aid.

[Correspondent] And so the presidential election is behind us. What in your view will determine social life in the immediate future?

[Zyuganov] Ahead is the next Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. We must elect the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet and the Constitutional Court and form a new government. People are awaiting the signing of the new Union treaty—after all it will determine the fate of the country and of each one of us.... The elections to the local organs of power also lie ahead. In brief, there will obviously be no lull in sociopolitical life. It is important that we do not forget, as has happened,

our heavy daily work. Our party must set up close cooperation with the new authorities and with other political parties and movements to lead the country and the republic as rapidly as possible out of the crisis which has erupted. This will benefit not only the country but also the party itself for only in real work can it rise up and strengthen. I believe that is what will happen.

Russian Role in Arctic, Scandinavia Stressed

PM0107143191 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 27 Jun 91 p 12

[Report on undated Moscow interview with Russian Republic Deputy Foreign Minister Andrey Fedorov by Halvor Tjonn]

[Text] Moscow—"The coal we get from Svalbard is certainly not cheap. In the slightly longer term it is possible that we will find a more rational solution than maintaining the Russian involvement on its present scale. So we for our part will not be changing things in Svalbard more than that," Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Andrey Fedorov said, expressing in addition his complete satisfaction with the cooperation with the Norwegian authorities.

"As far as our involvement in Svalbard is concerned, it is something that will have to be looked at," he continued. "When the Soviet authorities began the work of building up the settlements they did so exclusively for military and political reasons. Today there are no such considerations. Let me remind you in this context that the Russian Republic has declared that not a single Russian kopek will go to upholding regimes in countries like Cuba and Vietnam.

"I would also like to stress an important consideration," the Russian foreign minister said with emphasis. "Hereafter it will be the Russian Republic and not the Soviet central government which has the responsibility for our settlements on the island group in the Arctic Ocean."

Andrey Fedorov knows Norway well. In an hour-long interview with AFTENPOSTEN he demonstrated an intimate knowledge of our country and a great interest in extending relations between Norway and the Russian Republic. Since the election of Boris Yeltsin as president the republic has been putting its efforts into becoming an active protagonist in the foreign policy field, not least in relations with its neighbors. Fedorov stressed time and time again that the Soviet Union's neighboring states must prepare themselves for real changes. The republics have become more independent in their actions, also in the field of foreign policy. The Kremlin can no longer draft its own policy without consulting them. In particular Russia—by far the biggest of the Union's republics—wants to make its voice heard.

[Tjonn] What about Russian representation in Norway? Could there be any suggestion of setting up some form of representation in Oslo?

[Fedorov] We will not destroy the existing system of Soviet embassies by setting up a parallel system of representation. However, before long we will be sending out our own Russian representatives who will work inside the Soviet embassies. You as well as we will benefit from these direct contacts.

In general we want as many direct contacts with Norway as possible. This is more than politeness on my part. One of the most important things we can do in this context is get a Norwegian consulate in Murmansk. This would make contacts between northern Russian and northern Norway considerably easier. Perhaps we should have a Russian consulate in Kirkenes, but first and foremost we need a Norwegian consulate in Murmansk.

It is important that we view developments on the entire North Calotte as a whole—that is, we have to develop broad cooperation between Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the northwestern parts of Russia. I hope that next year we will be able to sign an agreement with the Nordic Council, with a view to drawing our northwestern regions into the sphere of Nordic cooperation. A Nordens Hus [joint Nordic cultural center] here in Moscow or Leningrad would receive a warm welcome. Our own ambitions in this respect are not inconsiderable: We want to develop a generation of Russians who know Scandinavia—the countries' languages, politics, and economic life.

As far as economic development in the northern regions is concerned, it is impossible without the broad involvement of foreign capital. Norwegian businessmen are welcome to invest in our economic free zones that have just been established. Now there is no longer any restriction on foreign involvement; Western firms are welcome to set up 100-percent-owned subsidiaries.

[Tjonn] Is it possible that the border in the north between Norway and Russia could become as open as the border between Norway and Sweden?

[Fedorov] Quite soon we will be able to open the border to the local population. But Norway must be one of the countries particularly interested in some form of restraint on the Russian side. A completely open border without anything more than symbolic checks would turn all of northern Norway into a tent city, full of Russians on the move. That would be in no one's interests.

[Tjonn] And close to the Norwegian-Soviet border lie the environmentally destructive nickel plants. Will there be any progress soon in environmental cooperation here?

[Fedorov] On this question, too, Oslo must understand that the key is no longer to be found in Moscow. You will find the key in Murmansk. You can if you like give money to the central authorities in Moscow for them to solve the problem. It is simply that if you do that the money will disappear, and the environment around Nikel will remain as polluted as it has always been.

Norway and Finland must establish firmer contacts with the authorities in Murmansk if there is to be any hope of a solution to this question.

[Tjonn] The Soviet military capacity on the Kola Peninsula is still being expanded. Large forces that can only be used against Norwegian targets are concentrated right on the Norwegian border. Does the Russian Republic understand that we do not much appreciate this, despite all the relaxation in East-West relations?

[Fedorov] Let me just say something in this context. If anyone on the Soviet side has ever talked about occupying Norway, this is the most lunatic idea that has ever been aired. The Russian republic has no—absolutely no—military interest in Norway. Russian authorities take the definite view that the Soviet Union must make the transition to a defense-oriented defense doctrine, and for this reason we will not support a further increase in military spending. The problem is that until recently we were unable to influence the constant military buildup that is taking place. We have that power now.

Western Republics

Debates at Belorussian Parliament Reported

PM0207140191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Correspondent N. Matukovskiy report: "Passions At and After the Session"]

[Text] Minsk—The Belorussian Supreme Soviet session which has just ended surpassed all the previous ones in terms of tension and results.

The parliamentary "subject" evolved in such a way that the culmination came during the final days. Passions flared up in earnest when the deputies got down to discussing the draft law on the status of a state of emergency. A. Malofeyev, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, "poured oil" on the polemical flames by proposing the previous day the introduction of a state of emergency throughout the country in order to save it from total collapse. The opposition's critical fire was so strong that the law was rejected on its first reading.

Passions flared up with renewed force when the draft law on the redistribution of power and the introduction of a presidential form of rule was submitted for discussion. Both the supporters and the opponents of the draft law drew arguments from the same source—the example of Russia. "You see, Russia is convinced that the state cannot exist without strong executive power." "Yes, but the entire people of Russia elected the president from among multiple candidacies. But you want to elect him at the session." The dispute ended in a compromise: The post of president is to be instituted in Belorussia, but he is nonetheless to be elected by the entire people, not at the session.

Right at the end People's Deputy Aleksandr Lukashenko committed a "breach of the peace" by "detaching" almost 50 deputies from the party group and creating the group "Communists of Belorussia for Democracy."

A Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee plenum was held which roundly condemned Lukashenko and his group.

Belorussian Trade Union Chief Urges New Law

OW0307081691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1030 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a press conference held in Minsk, the head of the Belorussian Federation of Trade Unions, Mr. Vladimir Goncharik, declared his federation's intention of "passing a trade union law at the autumn session of the Belorussian parliament. If this does not happen, we shall be forced to take mass action within the Constitution—demonstrations, manifestations, even strikes."

At the session just completed of the Supreme Soviet of Belorussia, such a law was not passed. As the market approaches, the federation considers that such a law is essential.

According to Mr. Goncharik "today we are witnessing an attack on the rights and freedoms of trade unions, an attempt is being made to paralyse the activity of workers. This is where the mistake of the Supreme Soviet lies."

Mr. Goncharik remarked that the Belorussian Federation of Trade Unions has succeeded in finding a place in the complex social and political life of the republic. It is independent of the law-making and executive powers and, if needed, could defend the rights of people. "That was the case during the April strikes, that will be the case in future," said Mr. Goncharik.

Belorussian Communists Decision on Conference

LD0207092491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] The plenum of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee has adopted a decision regarding convening the 20th all-Union CPSU conference. It says that the party in effect has been removed from participating in the making of state policy. The leadership of the party and state is being carried out by a narrow group of people, which ignores the Constitution and laws of the USSR. A lot of what is happening today has nothing in common with the perestroyka that was supported by the party and people in 1985.

In connection with this, the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee has proposed that the next plenum of the CPSU Central Committee should adopt a decision to convene a party conference in November-December, which should hear a report by CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev on the work of organizing the

implementation of the decisions of the 28th party congress, and should examine the issue of the CPSU minimum program for the next three-four years on resolving the socioeconomic and political crisis. After the adoption of the minimum program it should introduce amendments to the present party rules and carry out a re-registration of Communists in the party.

Ukraine Supreme Soviet Hears Anticrisis Plan

LD3006083191 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 0000 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Excerpts] We begin our program with a report about the work of the session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, the parliament, which continued today in Kiev. Today the discussions centered around the question of withdrawing Ukraine from the economic crisis. Prime Minister Vitold Fokin delivered a report on the issue. He said that the emergency plan is caculated for the period of two years. In particular, he said:

[Fokin is heard briefly, fading into English translation] I'm sure that over this period of time we shall manage to take control over the situation in economy, in other words, to stabilize it, says Vitold Fokin. We have chosen the road toward market-led economy and therefore our program, in certain aspects, contradicts a number of the USSR laws, the resolutions of the Cabinet of Ministers and several provisions of our republic's laws. This is why the government insists that the validity of certain legislative acts be suspended for the period of the implementation of the emergency program, said Vitold Fokin.

The program envisages that the enterprises which sell their products at the consumer market can use their profits to replenish the wage fund without any restrictions. To increase the production of baby food, supply the population with medicines, it has been proposed to relieve enterprises of the medical and pharmaceutical industries from income taxes. To step up entrepreneurship it is envisaged to map out the republic's program of expanding the network of cooperative, family, and other enterprises of such type.

So as to demonopolize economy and enhance competition among the producers, it has been envisaged to adopt antimonopoly legislation, increase the number of producers which work for the consumer market, develop the network of small enterprises, and set up alternative production units.

First and foremost, public servicing enterprises will be privatized and also those which produce consumer goods, process agricultural produce, and also small industrial, construction, and transportation enterprises.

The program envisages the creation of the national currency fund—the only source of currency in Ukraine now is the sale of its raw materials, natural resources, and goods manufactured in Ukraine. It has been decided that 70 percent of all the currency incomes which are now channelled to the centralized USSR fund will be sold by the enterprises to the republic's currency fund according to commercial exchange rate.

To expand trade and economic relations, intergovernmental agreements will be signed with the East European countries.

A vast network of joint ventures, protection units, and associations will be set up according to the program, submitted by the premier of Ukraine.

Further on, Vitold Fokin said the following:

[Fokin is heard briefly, fading into English translation] The program elaborated by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is based on the administration by mere injunction methods of economic management, continues Vitold Fokin. In our program we stake the use of economic regulators. Only with their help can we stimulate in practical terms market relations in the republic's economy.

The premier underlined that special monetary units will be introduced so as to protect republic's consumer markets. With this aim, the bank notes now used on the territory of the USSR will be marked by special seals. The expenses of the state enterprises, associations, and organizations for the maintenance of their managing apparatuses will be reduced by 30 percent.

To stimulate the production of food products, it is planned to turn a whole number of unprofitable collective and state farms into associations, cooperative agencies, stock companies, leasing enterprises, and so on. A special fund will be set up to support agricultural enterprises.

It has been proposed to introduce a moratorium on the construction of at least 200 industrial enterprises for a period of the implementation of the emergency program.

The primary measures aimed at social protection of the population will be directed at replenishing the consumer market by food products, improvement of the health care system, education, and culture, measures to protect population against unemployment.

Pensions will be increased to those people who had been groundlessly subjected to repressions in the years of Stalin's rule.

Luncheon credits will be given to young people. A network of employment offices will be set up and a firm for the promotion of employment will be also set up in the Ukraine.

All administrative restrictions will be abolished for earning individual wages.

Further on, Vitold Fokin said that a package of draft laws has been submitted for the consideration of the deputies which go in line with the anticrisis program. These, in particular, are the draft laws on indexation of

the money incomes of the population, on the minumum consumer budget, on consolidating social guarantees for the working people.

During the discussion of the anticrisis program and the package of draft laws, 35 deputies expressed their views on the problem ahead. Although some deputies strongly criticized the draft program, the majority arrived at the conclusion that it must be implemented without delay. [passage omitted]

Further on, as a result of the voting, the anticrisis program and earlier considered package of draft laws were adopted on the whole and passed over for further updating. [passage omitted]

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Discusses Union Treaty

LD2706215291 Moscow TASS in English 2103 GMT 27 Jun 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Alexey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev June 27 TASS—By September 1 the permanent commissions of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet should conclude discussing the draft Union treaty and present their assessment of the draft's correspondence of the declaration on the state sovereignty of the Republic. The Ukrainian parliament decided this at its session today. By September 15 the working group is to sum up all proposals and remarks regarding the draft treaty on a union of sovereign states.

The discussion of the draft Union treaty has become a watershed for Ukrainian parliamentarians, dividing them into two large groups.

Most delegates declared that the question of whether or not the Ukraine should be in the union of sovereign states is not posed. During the all-Union referendum and the republican poll, the Ukrainian people confidently and unambiguously answered this question in the affirmative. Everyone who declares at rallies, in the press and in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet against the Republic's participation in the Union ignores the will of the people and tries to impose on it the decisions that have nothing in common with its vital interests.

In contrast to this attitude, there were other pronouncements. Their essence is that in drafting the treaty the centre ignored sovereignty of the Republic and tried to ensure that it preserves all the structures of a superpower.

Much was said at the evening meeting about the insufficient participation of Ukrainian representatives in drafting the treaty. For instance, Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Soviet Vladimir Grenev said that the Ukrainian parliament avoided work on the draft treaty for various reasons. At the same time he noted that a more rigid federation as compared to the 1922 state treaty, is being created.

Head of the parliament Leonid Kravchuk summed up the results of the discussion. He said that the Ukrainian people wishes to live in a union of sovereign states. But there are quite a few provisions in the draft treaty which require further work.

Ukraine Committee Opposes Union Treaty

LD3006074991 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] The Committee of Civic Accord has adopted an address to deputies of the Ukrainian parliament and to all citizens of the Ukraine. According to the address: National riches have been plundered; the colonial economy has become bankrupt; rivers and air are extremely polluted; millions of innocent people have been murdered; and people's spirits are desolated. Such is the result of the "blossoming of free republics within the unshakable union" [quotation from official Ukrainian anthem].

The committee has appealed to people's deputies not to vote for any form of the Union treaty. An independent Ukraine first, and only afterwards agreements with equal neighbors without the Kremlin's supervision, the address stresses.

Ukraine Democratic Revival Party Opens Congress

Various Topics Discussed

LD0107085391 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 0000 GMT 30 Jun 91

[Text] The second congress of the Ukraine's Democratic Revival Party began its work today [29 June] in Kiev. About 200 delegates from all regions of Ukraine have arrived to participate in the congress. The Ukraine's Democratic Revival Party is also called a party of former communists who left the Communist Party because of their different attitudes toward the future union of the republics.

If the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine stands for signing a Union treaty, the Ukraine's Democratic Revival Party comes out for abolishing the USSR's statehood by transforming it into a community of sovereign states. This was [words indistinct] for discussion in today's sitting of the congress when its delegates were considering changes to the program of action and to the rules of the party. [passage indistinct] As a matter of fact, the Ukraine's Democratic Revival Party comes out for introduction of a presidency in Ukraine (?stemming) from the fact that no matter who is elected the president, he will oppose the union bodies of power. Presidential power will significantly weaken the power of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine. During discussion of the program of action it was stressed as a necessity of (?stopping) the action of the USSR's Constitution [passage indistinct].

During the discussion [words indistinct] economic policy of the Ukraine's Democratic Revival Party it was said that the party [words indistinct] of overcoming the totalitarian economic power of the existing system and confirmation of economic democracy. The party will strive for holding a referendum on the issues of depoliticization of the armed forces, the militia, the KGB, and the courts, as well as for a three-term [words indistinct] elections on a multiparty basis. The party stands for noninterference of the state, including church affairs. The party stands out for granting credits to the (?new families) who provide housing construction, for a beneficial taxation (?to expansion) of training students and young specialists abroad, for a close [word indistinct] with the youth organizations of Ukraine having a democratic direction. The [word indistinct] congress of the Ukraine's Democratic Revival Party will continue its work.

Resolutions Adopted

LD0107152191 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 0000 GMT 1 Jul 91

Today, [30 June], the second congress of the Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine ended its work in Kiev. Now the membership of this party is about 2,000. Changes and amendments were introduced today in the program principles and the regulations of the party. The Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine declares its desire to turn Ukraine into an independent sovereign democratic state, with an effective market economy and social protection of all strata of the population. The primary task of the party at the current stage is to achieve a majority in parliament and local bodies of state authority, form a coalition government of national trust involving democratic forces of the republic. The party considers the Ukraine should be a federative state with autonomy in the Crimea. The Party of Democratic Revival sees the Ukraine as a presidential republic with a two-chamber parliament. According to the party principles, the election system in the republic should be reformed, and the Ukraine should have its own armed forces subordinated to the government of the republic.

The delegates at the congress adopted a number of resolutions recommending to step up the activities of the party members in the local bodies of power, to work on uniting the (?parties) of social, democratic, and liberal trends, and do everything possible to prevent interethnic hostilities in the Ukraine. The congress participants decided to counteract the signing of the new Union treaty, to launch a presidential election campaign, hold a republican conference on questions of economic policy, start the formation of a shadow cabinet.

Today, the second congress of the Party of Democratic Revival of the Ukraine completed its work.

Ukraine, Armenia Discuss Mutual Goods Deliveries

LD0107175991 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Text] At a meeting in Kiev, representatives of Ukraine and Armenia discussed fulfillment of the intergovernmental agreement on mutual deliveries in 1991. Participating in it were Ukrainian Prime Minister Fokin; Manukyan, chairman of Armenia's Council of Ministers; and leaders of republican ministries and departments.

In a businesslike and friendly atmosphere they analyzed the causes of mutual underdeliveries which inflict substantial economic losses to both sides. They also worked out mutually acceptable decisions on retaining in 1991 a level of mutual deliveries not lower than that of last year.

It was also deemed necessary to introduce a (?meticulous) control over the deliveries of most important goods. Participants in the meeting then signed a protocol which envisages broadening the existing direct economic relations between enterprises of the two republics, regardless of who owns them. In cases of necessity, enterprises and organizations will be included into the fulfillment of agreements which are not situated on the territories of the two republics, and also foreign partners.

Moldova Leader on Molotov-Ribbentrop Conference

OW0207110191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1000 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Chairman of Moldova's parliament Aleksander Moshanu said he regretted the fact that, though they had been invited, no representatives from the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of History, the Institute of General History and the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences' Institute of History and the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences Institute of History had taken part in an international conference on "The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and its Consequences for Bessarabia". The Moldova parliamentary leader said this in an inteview to the national radio in which he addressed the results of the conference that had taken place in Kishinev from June 26-28.

Moshanu denied that the conference did not have any objective other than that of slamming the door on the way out of the Union.

"Such decisions are taken by parliament and people, not at a conference. We wanted to put our viewpoint to a test and it has stood the test. Everything that has happened to all of us, to the Union, is a tragic zigzag in our history."

According to him, many things should be revised now because ethnic policies were based on dogma born in Stalin's and other heads, not on scholarship.

Caucasus

Armenian Deputy Favors Sovereign State

OW0307091391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Levon Ter-Petrosyan and his lieutenants are bent on abandoning the path of democratic reform and establishing a totalitarian regime in Armenia, believes Mr. Paruir Airikyan, leader of the Union for National Self-Determination and Deputy of the republic's parliament.

In an interview with IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent, Mr. Airikyan said he was in favour of Armenia becoming a sovereign state as early as possible. He said his union was for an early referendum on the issue of independence and for the holding of a Constitutent Assembly.

An altogether different opinion, however, was expressed on Tuesday by the ANKAKHUTYUN ("Independence") newspaper published in Yerevan, IF's correspondent reports. The paper believes that "the latest meetings of the Supreme Soviet have shown that the incumbent authorities seem to be on the point of reforming themselves and in order to maintain their positions are prepared to make certain concessions to national-democratic forces."

A telling sign of this has been the recent decision by the Supreme Soviet to institute the office of president in the republic, to be elected by direct popular vote.

In spite of the fact that Armenia's present leadership took this step reluctantly and belatedly, the institution of presidency in Armenia has been, on the one hand, its first serious compromise with the national-democratic forces, and on the other hand, opposition has won its "first major victory", Ankakhutyun opines.

Armenian Police Agencies Deny Article

NC3006103591 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1830 GMT 29 Jun 91

[Text] The press has published the statement issued by the heads of the Armenian Republic's law enforcement agencies on the interviews published in the 26 June edition of PRAVDA with leading staffers of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD], Procuracy, and Committee for State Security. PRAVDA ran the interviews under the title "Return to Initial Positions." The article attempted to provide objective information to the public about the situation in the region. In fact, however, current developments were not assessed objectively, were often contradictory, and were presented in a conflicting and absurd way which served only to further confuse the reader, already saturated with conflicting news from the region.

The statement by the chiefs of Armenia's law enforcement agencies refutes these fraudulent facts and obviously pro-Azerbaijani observations point by point. In addition, the statement presents numerous cases where the law has been broken and gives a true picture of events.

The statement adds: What has actually taken place? During May operations, 91 Armenians were killed and more than 3,000 were taken from their permanent homes in the villages of Nagorno-Karabakh and Khanlarskiy rayon in Azerbaijan. The USSR MVD staffers killed 14, injured 28, and took hostage. They also disarmed 60 of their Armenian MVD colleagues. Those disarmed were not bandits but Armenian MVD staffers who were fulfilling their service inside their own republic. The circumstances of the cruel murder of 10 Armenian militiamen in Voskepar village in Armenia is known to all. It has been proven that they did not fire a single shot and put up no resistance whatsoever to the operations. The Armenian Procuracy has instituted criminal proceedings in connection with this incident and has opened due investigation; however, its request for a team of inspectors from the USSR Procuracy to be sent to the republic has been turned down.

Armenia Decides To Retain 1918 Anthem

NC0207121691 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian 1730 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Report by Mavr Danielyan and Mesrop Saakyan from the second session of the first convocation of the Armenian Supreme Soviet on 1 July; recorded]

[Excerpts] [Unidentified correspondent] [passage omitted] After the recess the session debated the bill on amendments and addenda to the administrative and criminal codes of the Armenian Republic in connection with the violations of the administrative regulations. At its evening sitting the Supreme Soviet decided to continue the debate on this matter tomorrow.

Ktrich Sardaryan, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, submitted a report on the results of the competition concerning the anthem and emblem of the Armenian Republic. He said that despite the extension of the deadline for the competition, nothing was finalized and two alternatives remained regarding the anthem: one is the widely known "Our Fatherland" [The anthem of independent Armenia between 1918-1920 and used since the 23 August 1990 declaration of independence as an interim anthem], and the other is the composition by Arno PaPadzhanyan and Aleksandr Arutyunyan in 1940, but with new words. Similarly, two alternatives remained regarding the emblem: one is the emblem designed by Martiros Saryan, with some changes. The other is the emblem of the Armenian Republic of 1918-1920.

The music composed by Arno PaPadzhanyan and Aleksandr Arutyunyan, as well as "Our Fatherland", were performed at the Supreme Soviet. [passage

omitted] Various proposals then were put forward, but the debate basically centered on whether to adopt "Our Fatherland" or the music composed by Arno Papadzhanyan and Aleksandr Arutyunyan. "Our Fatherland" was endorsed. Some changes will be made to its words and it will be presented to the parliament.

The parliament will continue its deliberations tomorrow. Now, esteemed radio listeners, let us listen to "Our Fatherland", which as of today was adopted as the national anthem.

Armenia Asks G-7 To Intercede With Gorbachev

NC0207122091 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 1 Jul 91

[Statement issued by the press center of the Armenian Supreme Soviet; date not given]

[Text] Yerevan, 1 Jul (ARMENPRES)—Chairman of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet Levon Ter-Petrosyan has sent a message to the heads of the world's seven developed countries. In presenting the cases where the basic rights of the Armenian citizens who were illegally detained and transferred to Azerbaijan in the aftermath of atrocities recently committed against Armenia were violated, the message notes that despite the measures taken by the republic's authorities, and the numerous messages sent to the heads of the country's political and law enforcement organs, no real mediation effort has been undertaken by them to secure the release of the hostages or transfer them from the Azerbaijani isolation cells and submit the criminal cases to the jurisdiction of the USSR Procuracy.

Stressing that the concern among the population for the fate of their compatriots and kin generates further emotions and additional tension, which in turn impedes the normal functioning of the state organs and endangers the democratic gains, Levon Ter-Petrosyan called on them to intercede with President Gorbachev on the eve of the forthcoming London meeting of the G-7 for the solution to that enormously important problem for our republic.

Azerbaijan Agrees To Sign Union Treaty

LD2806090291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Video interview with Elmira Mikhail kyzy Kafarova, chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, by television correspondent M. Mamedov at 26 June session of Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] The Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet continued its work today in Baku.

[Mamedov] To hold universal direct elections for the president of the republic on 8 September this year—that was the decision made today by the Parliament of Azerbaijan. It also adopted a law on the conduct of the elections. [Video shows Mamedov interviewing Kafarova]

The session is now proceeding to examine a crucial item on the agenda—the draft Union Treaty. What is your forecast?

[Kafarova] My forecast is that the Supreme Soviet will approve the draft in principle and will confirm a plenipotentiary delegation for signing the treaty, led by Ayaz Niyazovich Mutalibov, the president of our republic.

[Mamedov] But what is your confident forecast, as it were, based on?

[Kafarova] My confident forecast is based on the fact that, during the discussion at the last session of the Supreme Soviet, many criticisms were expressed, which have been taken into account in the new text. This provides grounds for saying that Azerbaijan forms part of the Union, from its own point of view, and its point of view is being taken into account.

[Mamedov] The forecast of the head of the republic's Parliament was fully borne out. After numerous debates, a majority of people's deputies voted to support the proposal to conclude a new Union Treaty and confirm the composition of the plenipotentiary delegation for carrying out further work on, and signing, that important document.

[Announcer] We have just heard that, disagreeing with the session's decisions, the deputies of the Independent Azerbaijan bloc left the meeting chamber in protest.

Central Asia

Kazakh's Nazarbayev Assails 'Extremist Demands'

PM3006181191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the "Our Digest" rubric: "What They Are Writing, What They Are Saying"]

[Text] From the speech of N. Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], in the June broadcast of the Kazakh television program "An Hour With the President":

"...Our position regarding the overweening demands made by certain Cossack leaders to redraw the republic borders was expressed at a meeting of the republic aktiv with the participation of M. Gorbachev. We will never, under any circumstances, agree to such absurd ideas. The territory of Kazakhstan is indivisible. Incidentally, the Law on Criminal Liability for Inflaming Interethnic Strife operates in our country... Let me not be misunderstood here.

"If the Cossacks want to revive their traditions, customs, and culture, there can be no objections to this. We consistently defend and observe the interests and rights

of all nationalities living in the republic. But creating military formations and celebrating the 400th anniversary of the Cossacks' service to the tsar—that is too much. Do they really not understand that this will evoke a negative response among the population? And indeed who needs this? I understand the ordinary working Cossacks very well. These people are far removed from such extremist demands."

Kazakhstan Rejects Referendum on Election

LD2906075991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1348 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] Nursultan Nazarbeyev today submitted the question of a universal referendum on the presidency in Kazakhstan for consideration by the session of the republic's Supreme Soviet. The result was that 149 deputies voted against, and only 111 for. Thus, if the law on the presidency is followed, there should not be a universal election in Kazakhstan.

Kyrgyz's Akayev Outvoted on Land Ownership Issue

PM3006145391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 91 p 1

[Report by K. Bayalinov: "Akayev Outvoted"]

[Text] An extraordinary Kyrgyz Supreme Soviet session has ignored President Akayev's veto. A majority voted not to include on the agenda his amendment to the land code stating that land in the republic belongs not to the Kyrgyz people but to all the nations and nationalities which go to make up the people of Kyrgyzstan. Thus from now on the land and mineral resources will belong exclusively to the Kyrgyz people in the republic. I do not know what prompted the parliamentarians to make such a decision, but they now bear the full weight of responsibility for the possible consequences. Time will soon tell how the Russians, Uzbeks, Dungans, and other non-Kyrgyz communities will react to this demarche. They constitute no less than approximately 50 percent of the republic's entire population!

Furthermore, on his own behalf and on behalf of his supporters, President Akayev apologized to Russian President Boris Yeltsin for the attacks and insults to which he was subjected during the last plenum of the republic Communists' Central Committee, in which P.K. Luchinskiy, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the Politburo, participated.

Kyrgystan Adopts Laws on Market Economy

LD3006080491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Bishkek, 28 Jun (TASS)—The fifth extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Kyrgystan finished work today. Over three days the deputies have adopted a number of laws opening the way for Kyrgystan's economy to make the transition to market relations. Laws on foreign investment, on joint-stock companies, and on the republic's state bank were adopted, among others.

The draft law on the general bases for privatization and entrepeneurship provoked the most discussion. It was adopted in its first reading. Parliamentarians have decided to submit the draft law for general discussion. Then they are to return to it for a second time at the autumn session.